

8-1985

UA68/8/2 Paul Cook Oral History

Lowell Harrison

WKU Oral History Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/dlsc_ua_records



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Harrison, Lowell, "UA68/8/2 Paul Cook Oral History" (1985). *WKU Archives Records*. Paper 925.
http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/dlsc_ua_records/925

This Transcription is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in WKU Archives Records by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

THIS IS LOWELL HARRISON INTERVIEWING DR. PAUL COOK IN CHERRY HALL ON THE AFTERNOON OF AUGUST 2, 1985.

Lowell Harrison: Paul, suppose we start off with a bit of your personal background, where are you from?

Paul Cook: Hart County, Kentucky.

LH: It's a big county, can you be more specific?

PC: Well, yes, generally Horse Cave.

LH: Is that where you went to school?

PC: I went to, I started the school, in a one-room school, in Seymour, Kentucky.

LH: I have heard of it.

PC: It went through grade 1-3 and then started to Horse Cave and continued grade school, junior high school and high school. Then my senior year the Horse Cave/Cave City districts merged and I was in the first graduating class of Caverna High School.

LH: What year was that?

PC: 1951.

LH: And then did you come on to Western?

PC: I came to Western for a year and a half and transferred to Lipscomb, David Lipscomb in Nashville in the spring of 53, there was a young lady involved, that was not an educational decision. Scratch that from the tape. When we returned to Western that fall, the Caverna School District was in desperate need of a teacher and the principal talked me into teaching in junior high that year which I did and I was drafted then in the summer, as you know, by the summer of 54.

LH: You're not talking about the principal drafting?

PC: No, no, Uncle Sam drafted me in the spring of 1954. I stayed in service for two years and came back to Western in the fall of 56.

LH: Did you come to Western simply because it was nearby, or any particular inducement.

PC: Near by and at that time, in view of my family's financial situation, if I could get to Western and get finished I would be fortunate.

LH: What did you major in here?

PC: I had two or three hitches at a major and I finally ended up majoring in history.

LH: Who were some of the people in the department that you had classes with?

PC: The department, when I first came to Western, was the department that had been the department in the 30s, 40s, and 50s. I had classes with the, all of them but Dr. Stickles. I had classes with Ms. Egbert, Ms. Robertson, Ms. Anderson and Dr. Poteet.

LH: Let's talk a little bit about them, if you would. What stands out in your mind in particular about say each of them?

PC: The, my freshman year here in the Fall of 1951, I had Ms. Robertson for what was the first course in American History. And I have often thought for an 18 year old man, to feel the fear I did, in her class, was outstanding.

LH: The army held no terror.

PC: None what so ever. It's been, well it's been 34 years this fall, and I still remember it was in 208 and I sat in the second seat in the front next to the window. She was certainly unlike any teacher that I had seen before. Herness, her interest in students, and I guess the thing that I, and I hope you will forgive me for this, but there were two A's in that class, and I had one of them. That's one A that I'm exceptionally proud of.

LH: I congratulate you. She did not give em.

PC: And when the class started, I probably thought I would have been happy to have an F. Because I wasn't sure I would do that well.

LH: Paul, did she at that time require you to outline the course.

PC: No.

LH: Oh, she had lowered her standards since I had her then. We had to outline the entire course under major movements.

PC: Now we studied it by movements, but I didn't remember outlining it. The thing I guess that was so shocking for freshman out of high school, and I had a good high school history teacher--Ralph Dorsey, who was the basketball coach, and was an excellent teacher, a graduate of Indiana University was my high school teacher and he was very

good--but it was so different from anything I had anticipated, and particularly the additional reading that was required. I had just not anticipated that.

LH: Did you learn to dodge her in the library to avoid additional readings.

PC: Yes, I experienced that with Ms. Robertson and Ms. Egbert, also. The first course I had with Ms. Egbert was English History and she had accused me of dodging her classes. And, again, there was an experience I don't think I'll ever forget. I had her in summer school and the first day she spoke the entire period and made the assignments. The second day of class, she began with a question, routinely with me, and we talked the entire period. She and I were the only ones who did any talking. She initiated that, I didn't. The second day it was the same way. And the third day, this would have been the fourth day of class, but the third day of our discussion, and I thought that she was maybe just going to run me off or else. And part of the way through that period she went to someone else and she went around the entire class that way. I thought that the two of them were two of the better teachers that I have experienced anyway.

LH: I would agree. I had both of them as well. They did tend to make graduate school easy.

PC: The English history class I had I think was a 200 level course. Maybe 300 level. And it was, except for writing major papers, she required as much as any graduate school course. And the reading, in particular. And the thing, I guess, that impressed me most about her was that she knew everything that was in all the books she required you to read.

LH: Yes.

PC: And you didn't dare try to fake it. Well, you did but once.

LH: True. What about the other members?

PC: Ms. Anderson I had for a couple of western history classes, and I think a Western, at that time, European History. Ms. Anderson was a teacher that stimulated some interest in the class, but did not have the depth that the other two had. I thought it came through a good bit in her classes. And neither did she have the control with the class and respect of the class that Ms. Robertson and Ms. Egbert had. Dr. Poteet who became head of the department while I was a student here. I had, I don't know, two or three classes with him, and my impression was that he knew much more than he was able to convey to students. And his classes might or might not deal with the subject at hand.

LH: Were there only four people in the department then?

PC: When I first came Dr. Stickles was here. I did not have him for a class. And then when I came back after the service, there was a lady who had joined the faculty. I believe her name was Polly Davis, but that...

LH: Yes, she died just a year or two ago I believe.

PC: Yes, and she was here a year or two.

LH: Clarence Deadman had gone before you started here?

PC: Yes, my mother knew him.

LH: I'm not going to respond to that. I had classes with him. Who were some of the other faculty members outside the history department whom you remember especially well?

PC: I had Miss Richards in English and I especially remember her. But there was a gentleman here in Geography who was here when I returned from the service and then left and returned to the University faculty in the late 60s by the name of Goodman. And he was, he came here from Graduate School. In fact he had not finished his dissertation when he came. He was as demanding as anyone that I had, particularly the first time around. I had a first year geography class with him and the highest grade in that class was a C. But when he came back in the 60s he had adjusted his standards. He was a good teacher. I have an undergraduate minor in Geography and had Dr. Carol for geography class and had Ms. Cockrill, Willard Cockrill, and Paul Terrill. In the sciences I had Dr. H.L. Stevens for Biology. One of the more interesting people I had for class was Dr. Earl Moore in English. Dr. Moore, that was a particularly interesting lecturer. I suppose anyone who writes about tombstones must have some interesting aspect to their life. Those are some that come to mind readily.

LH: Did Western still have the chapel when you started?

PC: It had chapel one day a week.

LH: It was still for everyone, though?

PC: It was for everyone, right.

LH: What was your reaction to chapel? Or the student body, perhaps, generally, during that period?

PC: I guess to freshmen it was sort of startling, because you forget that most of us that came from rural areas had not thought about having chapel. To upper classmen it was an irritation and people were beginning to cut chapel and go to the goal post some. In

fact it was while I was here that mandatory chapel ended. I can't remember whether it was before I went into the service or after. But it was in the 50s.

LH: But it was mandatory?

PC: Yes, for freshmen.

LH: Oh, ok.

PC: No, I believe when I first came--no I guess it was just for freshmen.

LH: I know Cherry had always prided himself upon not having mandatory chapel. But he was also known to go out around campus to the goal post and pull in students.

PC: Well, I came back as a faculty member it was mandatory for freshmen. In fact there was a fixed seating chart. And I remember that one of the secretaries in the Dean of Student's Office would sit in Van Meter and check the seating chart. And students got a grade for chapel based on attendance.

LH: Did you feel chapel at that time was performing much of a function?

PC: It was a good place to make announcements. You could have pep rallies. I cannot remember a single individual who came and made a speech that had a lasting impact. In fact most of the events at chapel were performances by campus group, musical group, a speech. I believe it was during that period that some of the winners of the oratorical contest spoke at Chapel.

LH: I think for years that was a fairly standard program to deliver their winning orations.

PC: Right. So those are the only kind of things I really remember.

LH: Paul, as an undergraduate, did you come in contact with any of the top administrators, deans, presidents?

PC: More when I came back after service. When I came back after service they would be, this was in 1956, it was beginning to be some effort toward student government again. And the reason I say again, is because it had fallen into disservice.

LH: Now, in that period of time, between your first and second comings, there had been a change in presidency.

PC: Right, and I suppose before finishing I should go back and tell you that President Garrett, who was president when I came, the one thing that I remember, there had been

several cycles of tension raised in this country. There was one in either 1950 or 1951. And at that time there were four dorms on campus, I guess. Potter, McLean, maybe just three, what's now Schneider and McLean and Potter. And I was living in Potter and some guys decided it would be good to have a panty raid in McLean. And when the group got there there was a state trooper in the drive. And that pretty well scuttled it. Plus the rumor started that the dorm mother, and I can't remember who it was, maybe Mrs. Roundtree, had a shotgun across her lap. None of which I'm sure was true. But it had the impact. Well the next day President Garrett called all the men on campus together in van Meter. And it's the one impression I have out of him, he was, when I returned to school, as you said, he was deceased, and Dr. Thompson was president. But he said, "Now, boys, I'll tell you. This old farmers send their girls in here to school and if you steal their panties, they won't understand it." And he really defused the whole thing with his speech. And that was pretty much the end of that cycle of panty raids. Well then when I came back after service, Kelly Thompson, of course, was president. There was an effort then to begin some form of student government. In fact I guess that was the time that Charlie Keown became dean of students, '56, I believe.

LH: Somewhere in there, I think.

PC: And there was the presidential advisory committee. And I was on the presidential advisory committee. So I had that kind of dealings with Keown and Dr. Thompson. The only other dealings I had would be the, to go to the registrar's office or the dean's office to get whatever forms signed to graduate.

LH: Alright, let me ask you one more thing about Garrett before we talk about some of these other people. When you were here, was he still getting any visitational chapel talks on his readings?

PC: I don't remember any. I've heard of others talk about it, but I don't remember.

LH: In my day, he did that, on, oh perhaps, one semester or so. They were, for anyone who did any reading, they were among the more interesting I think of the chapel programs. Because he read, checked practically all the new books out of the library first. I think he spent much more time, perhaps, reading, then he did at administration. Who was the dean then?

PC: Dr. Grice.

LH: Any contacts with him?

PC: Just one. I went in to change a class, and I got the class changed. I don't remember now, I believe it was a sociology class. Which reminds me of a sociology teacher I had.

LH: Who?

PC: Walton. He was here in the 50s. He had a degree from the University of Chicago. And for a naive kid from Hart County, he was certainly more cosmopolitan than the people in Seymour. For some reason I had to change one of his classes; however, I did have two classes with him. What I did find out was you got the same thing, whichever class you signed up for. But it was an educational experience for me. And not only the introduction to him but the introduction to sociology. I had to go to Dean Grice to get a class changed, and I remember thinking that it will have to be a much bigger need next time than it was for me this time to have to go through this again.

LH: I gather those didn't really get the benefit of his cussing vocabulary?

PC: No, but the person in front of me did, so secondarily. He was, I don't remember what the occasion was, but it upset Dean Grice considerably and he was very graphic in his descriptions.

LH: You mentioned, I think, the registrar's office a moment ago, would that have been Cannon?

PC: Yes, sir, but the person I dealt with there was Nancy Bryan rather than Mr. Cannon, because Nancy was the person who signed degree programs and was extremely helpful. The only time I saw Mr. Cannon, as you undoubtedly recall, when you went through the maze of Cherry Hall to registrar, he put the big red "C" on your card.

LH: Perched up there on a stool and checking every registration card. You've mentioned a moment ago you thought there were perhaps three dorms at that period. What else did Western have in the way of major buildings?

PC: Well, of course, Cherry Hall, the training school, Gordon Wilson, what's now Gordon Wilson Hall, the library, Van Meter, the Cedar House, what is now the Margie Helm Library was the gymnasium.

LH: What was the Cedar House being used for?

PC: It was a student center. This was in 51. My first time. While I was gone, Garrett was built and when I came back, Garrett had been built.

LH: Now that was later added to, wasn't it?

PC: Yes, the ballroom was added and it was renovated. Well, of course the Home Economics building was here initially. When I first came the original industrial arts building, the music building ...

LH: Now you're talking about the music building that was torn down several years ago?

PC: Yes, that's now between what is now Grice Hall and the Graduate Center. And then in what is a parking lot between Grice Hall and North Hall was the rural school building. When I came here that was still here. And then in the area where Bates-Runner is now located was Chariton Village, is that what that was called?

LH: Yes. Was there much of that left?

PC: Oh, I suppose there probably were, probably as many as eight of those houses.

LH: There had been 70 some originally.

PC: Right. Well, the others at that time were down where the College of Education is now. And all of that area had a number of cottages and trailers. And some of those had been moved, as I understand it, from the area where Bates-Runner is now and Grice Hall down to that area and in 1951, oh there were probably, oh, I'd say 25 or 30 anyway.

LH: Those were the ones that had largely been brought in at the end of World War II.

PC: Right.

LH: From River Run and Oak Ridge.

PC: In fact they were still here when I came back in 56. And I'd say there were at least 25 or 30. Maybe there's more.

LH: What sort of general impression do you have of the student body of your era in the 50s? How serious minded...?

PC: Two different impressions when I look at the two groups. When I came as a freshman in 51 there were still a few World War II veterans here, and they added a serious dimension as well as one, I guess as a result of their World War II experiences, they kind of balanced work and play than some of the rest of us. There were certainly some good students here. I was associated with more capable students when I came back then I was in that period of time. In fact, in 56 through 58, when I was here and finished my bachelor's degree and began work on my masters, there were superb students here and several of them were in history. Two or three names come to mind-- Nancy Davis, she is now Nancy Hightower, who married Jim Davis, was here. Gray, who is now a Chemist at Cal Tech. Both of them were superb students. Wayne Dobson who is a noted economist, and head of the economics department here for a while was here. And there were a group of veterans, here, and of course those were basically Korean veterans. But several people in the history department who were excellent students. I

remember particularly the upper division history classes were very competitive, because there were excellent students here. And people like Ms. Robertson and Ms. Egbert very much enjoyed those people.

LH: I can imagine. You graduated then in 58?

PC: I finished my bachelor's degree at mid-year, actually I guess December of 57, well know it would have been January. Because back then the school year, the fall semester did not end until January. So I finished my bachelor's degree in January of 58. And while we were here, it was not easy to get a job in mid year, I did a semester's work on my masters in the spring of 58.

LH: And then you finished your masters, when?

PC: That was 59. I continued that spring and through the summer. And then I think took a class or two during the school year and came back the following summer and finished my masters.

LH: How did you find the graduate work here during that period? Was there much difference between that and your undergraduate?

PC: Not in the history department because once you got the upper division courses there really wasn't much in the upper division than in the graduate courses. I had, and I don't remember the distribution of hours, but about the same number of hours in history and in education. Most of the education classes were a disappointment. And the history classes, like I said, were like the undergraduate upper division.

LH: Did you take education as an undergraduate.

PC: Yes, I received certification to teach, and that's the reason after I left school in the spring of 58, I took a teaching job at Fort Knox High School and had planned to go into public school administration, so that's the reason I went the route of certification as an administrator than I took about the same number of hours in history and education.

LH: At the time you were doing your master's work, I don't remember the dates on this, could Western offer anything other than the Master of Education?

PC: We didn't have a masters in history. And I believe it was, oh I'm sure it was in the 60s, there may have been a masters in psychology in the late 50s, I'm not sure of that.

LH: I think a masters of history was one of the early ones that was started. Of course UK in particular had been, actually keeping us from offering anything at all in graduate

work, at least confined it to that. Well, we have you with a masters, why don't we go ahead with your more advanced work.

PC: Well, that was spread out over the next decade and a half.

LH: A common story.

PC: I came in 1960, and this will get off your outline a bit.

LH: I don't worry about that.

PC: I came back to Western as a young faculty member in 1960, so I took some graduate work along, and then in the summer of 65 was at Vanderbilt in a workshop and then, I guess, beginning in the summer of 66, started a graduate program in UK at the University of Kentucky in history and then in administration in a higher division. And, to make a long, long story brief, finished all the requirements in December 1972. I was only gone for two summers and a school year, but I drug out my dissertation.

LH: Once again, a common story. You mentioned a moment ago about doing some teaching. What was your teaching experience then before coming to western?

PC: I taught a year at Performa Junior High School and I taught two years at Fort Knox High School. The Fort Knox teaching was 1958-60 and Performa 1953-54.

LH: And then Paul you came here to the training school.

PC: In the fall of 1960.

LH: How did you happen to come?

PC: Polly McClure had taught the history at college high for I think since the 1930s, early 30s, maybe the late 20s, I'm not sure. Long time.

LH: I thought she did teaching for some time when I had her in the late 30s.

PC: Well, she had. I guess she came in the 20s.

LH: I wouldn't be surprised.

PC: She decided up in the summer to retire and James Carpenter, was director of the Training School, I was teaching up at Fort Knox, I was right happy with what I was doing, the superintendent had talked to me that spring about serving as a principal at the Junior high school that was being built the next year. Mr. Carpenter called me about coming down and talking to him about a job. And I told him I wasn't interested. And

he called me again and I came down, and we talked. And when he told me what the salary was, I told him I was sure I was not interested. So I went back home and he called again and said he had talked to Dr. Thompson, and at that time Dr. Thompson, as president, interviewed everyone who was employed as faculty, and a lot of the administrators. And I came back down and he, they offered me, I think \$700 more than they had before. And I told them salary was really not the matter, that I was not interested. So finally that summer I did take the job and started teaching in the training school in the fall of 1960. And at the same time taught in the history department. In fact, that fall, I taught 6 hours in the history department. Three on campus and three off. And I think every semester that I was in the training school I taught one class--that one semester I taught two. But every other semester I taught at least one class in the history department.

LH: Of course enrollment was beginning to go up.

PC: It was skyrocketing.

LH: We'll come back to that, perhaps, in another few moments. What impressed you about the training school at that time? How did it compare, for example, with the run of the mill high schools in this region?

PC: Well, certainly the quality of the students was better. Part of that was the selective process that was used, and there was a long waiting list for students to get into college high. A lot of them were students of Western faculty and staff. It came from a home background that emphasized education more than others. I was also impressed with several of the faculty members at College High. Some excellent faculty members.

LH: You taught there then how long?

PC: Four years. The last two years I had really planned to leave. In fact in the spring of 54...

LH: So you decided you were about to leave?

PC: I was going to leave. And I was at some kind of a banquet at the old Western Hills Restaurant the spring of 64 and Dero Downing was there and I had not known him very well except that I had had two of his children in class. And he asked me how it was going. And I said I was probably going to leave. And he wanted to know why. And I didn't really go into it much but I just told him that there were other alternatives that I should look at. And he said, "Well, you should go see Raymond Cravens." Said he's thinking of adding somebody in his office. And there was a real irony in that one, the next day I went to see Raymond Cravens. And I not only found out he was trying to add someone in his office, but he and Dr. Poteet had been talking about moving me to the

History department, but neither had bothered to mention it to me. So that's how that Fall I got moved to the history department. Now I don't really know how it was because I was not a part of that. But I was pleased to move.

LH: Paul, what was the relationship of training school faculty and college faculty at that time?

PC: It varied. I thought all during that period of time I had a good relationship with the college faculty in the history department. I guess in part because I had known several of them as faculty members. And then I taught a class as I indicated, in the history department. There were others that did not have that relationship. Some looked upon teachers in the training school as kind of an adjunct of the department of education, as it was. And personalities would enter into that kind of thing. The other thing I think, though, was we were involved in committees. I know I was, it was during a period of time that the first tenure policy was developed here, I was on the committee that developed the first tenure policy. And, I believe you and I have talked about this before, I think I was the only faculty member on that committee. There was a department head, Dr. Woods was on it, Ms. Tyler, I believe, and John Minton, as I recall. And by that time he was both a history faculty member and working in Dr. Cravens' office. And I think that was that committee. So that was quite a good bit of interaction between the two.

LH: Was the training school faculty considered to be a part of the Western faculty?

PC: Well, that was always debateable. At times yes, and at other times, no.

LH: Whenever it was most convenient?

PC: That's correct. We were always in the faculty meetings. We were, when I came, we were still going through the ritual of the Kentucky Building where you and your spouse walked down the steps to the acclaim of the assembled faculty in the Kentucky Building.

LH: Unfortunately, I missed that.

PC: It really is unfortunate. So, we had all of those involvements. Faculty at that time did not have rank assigned as we know have it. However, it did occur during that period of time. So we were probably neither fish nor fowl. Not totally excluded and not totally included.

LH: A moment ago you were mentioning Cravens, Downing, some of the new administrators. Were you really aware of the vast change in administration that took place in the late 50s? Did that cause much comment?

PC: That occurred in the 60s. Early 60s. I think. No I'm sure it did. No, No, Cravens came in the late 50s.

LH: I was thinking because there were about half a dozen who left about the same year.

PC: Of course I was not here then. That's right. Mr. Cannon and Dr. Grice...

LH: I think Jones in education.

PC: Jones, right.

LH: Wilson, Gordon Wilson in English. But there were several of them.

PC: I was not here. That occurred when I was teaching at Fort Knox. Then in the early 60s there were a number of department heads who had been around a long time who stepped down. Dr. Stevens, and a number of faculty. I remember going to early faculty meetings, and there was Dr. Dooley and Dr. Sumpter in Chemistry and Dr. Steve and, oh, I don't know, some others that as a young freshman I just kind of stood in awe of them. Then I came back and would sit with them in the same hall at a faculty meeting, and I really felt like I was out of place.

LH: How frequently were you having faculty meetings in the early 60s?

PC: Certainly more than one a semester. I don't, there was not a schedule, there were not scheduled meetings. But Dr. Thompson would call meetings of the faculty and administrative staff. But Dr. Thompson had something, he would call it administrative faculty. And they were administrators that were something other than super administrators, maybe, I don't know. But those, that would be a group that would constitute the meeting.

LH: Where did they meet?

PC: Generally Van Meter. And there was a lot of activity going on then. A lot of buildings, a lot of announcements about personnel changes. And Dr. Thompson would use those occasions to make those announcements. As you know, Board meetings during that period of time were closed meetings. And you did not get the flow of information you get today, either official or unofficial.

LH: Perhaps, Paul, this may test your memory somewhat, but now that you're over in the college, let's do a quick run through of the various positions which you have held. Can you remember them?

PC: Well, ...

LH: And then we'll come back and we'll talk about some more aspects.

PC: When I came to the history department in 1964, I taught full time for at least two years. But then I believe we were teaching 30 hours a year--15 a semester. But the first year I also worked a little bit in Cravens' office, and I didn't have a title, I just worked. And then I had a title of staff assistant and then I was assistant dean for something, I can't remember what that was. But I had things such as summer school and the night program.

LH: This would still have been Cravens' office?

PC: This was Cravens' office. And I held that title went through two or three evolutions, and I'm not going to tell you what all those were. But I basically had the same kind of functions, working with the academic council, basically working with the instructional areas, with the department heads just on facilitating, scheduling, moving into classrooms, new buildings, that kind of things. And that continued until 1969 when I took a year's leave of absence. No 68, I'm sorry, the spring of 68 I went on leave and came back in the fall of 69. And at that time I was assistant dean for something else, but I don't remember what that was. Still in Cravens' office. And I remember he came to me one day and he said "You'd better hurry up and finish your dissertation." And I said if you all quit giving me so much work to do I would. And then in November or December of 69 Mr. Downing asked me to come down to his office for a visiting. And he had been named President in August, I believe. And he asked me to join his staff. In January then of 70 I became assistant to the president. And I kept that title until 1975 and at that time I had the title change assistant to the president for resources management and became director of the budget. And I've kept that title since.

LH: Was there a great change in emphasis on your duties?

PC: After 75? Not initially but within a fairly short period of time there was.

LH: In the earlier period when you were assistant to the president? Were you that involved in the budget affairs?

PC: No, not that much. In 75 there was a fairly substantial shift in my responsibilities.

LH: Up until that wasn't Downing pretty much...

PC: No, Harry Largden did the budget. And Harry felt that it was not exactly a conflict of interest, but it was as he put it "not sufficient checks and balances." Because he was vice president for business affairs which was a major segment of the university for which a budget was made. He also then, as now, had the responsibility for oversight of the expenditures in all the areas and he was making the budget and overseeing the figures. And he felt that it would be appropriate to shift that to somebody else. And the

interesting thing about that, after about four or five years each of the public institutions in Kentucky went to that structure. Two of the new presidents have changed that, two that came in this year. But for several years there has been an individual in the president's staff that always had budgetary responsibilities.

LH: What was the change that those two have made?

PC: They have moved it back to the vice president for business affairs.

LH: Is that right.

PC: They have each come from out of state and their experience in other states was to have it on the vice president for business affairs. I think part of the reason for it in addition to what Harry had given us as a rationale is that in recent years there has been extensive involvement at the state level with both the council and with, what for a while, was the department of finance and is now finance administration. And being split out of that was the office that was known as the office of policy and management. And all of those units deal with budgeting at the state level. So there is a lot more ongoing kinds of activities there then there were ten years ago.

LH: As assistant to the president, up to 75, what were the things you were doing? To save time, what were you not doing? What were your functions there?

PC: I described it sometimes to people as emptying the wastebaskets and trimming the pencils. A lot of correspondence, helping coordinate reports, greeting people, going places when he couldn't go, some of the same kinds of things that I continued to do.

LH: You just answered my next question, then.

PC: It sounds terribly self serving, and I don't mean it this way, when I took on the budget function, I continued a lot of the things I'd been doing and took on the budget function. And that's not totally fair.

LH: I suspected that was true.

PC: I had, particularly in the early days when Mr. Downing was president, probably more involved in committees and other groups on campus. And then when Bob Cochran died, I probably worked more closely with what was in public relations for a period of time.

LH: He was a difficult person to replace.

PC: He was. Well, he has not been replaced in that he did some of the things that maybe he did because he was there and now they go on to something else. You know

we can have job descriptions or position descriptions and they generally cover what we do, what we do a lot of times is more influenced by the nature of the individual. And that certainly is true in Bob's case.

LH: Paul I want you to talk more, or listen to you talk more, about the administration and administrators. But before we do, let's come back again just a moment to the history department. As it had developed here and when you were teaching in the 60s. What are the changes that you see in it, personnel and otherwise, between your first acquaintance with it as an undergraduate and now when you're teaching in it.

PC: Well, the big one is the change in personnel. When I came back after service in 56, Dr. Poteet was head of the department, and when I started teaching he was head of the department. He continued as department head up until some time in the late 60s, I've forgotten that date.

LH: I think 66, 65 or 6.

PC: Of course Crawford Crowe became department head then. And when I moved from the training school to the history department, was in 64, Crawford Crowe and James Calloway joined the faculty. And by that time the faculty was the three of us, Crawford Crowe, me, Minton was still teaching a good deal, not a good deal, probably six hours, which for then was not, even I have a load. Jack Thacker was here, of course Carlton Jackson was here, Jim Bennett was here, the person who came with Jack as a graduate student from South Carolina was here, Barry. Barry and I were the only ones who were teaching Western Civ. In fact when I moved from the training school was when Western started teaching Western Civ. As you recall, for a long time the history department, unlike many departments in the country, did not teach western civilization. And Barry and I were the two individuals for a long time who taught Western Civ. Or not a long time, for a couple of years, because we were still teaching European history as one of the basic courses. So personnel had certainly changed. And you can't lose people like Ms. Egbert and Ms. Robertson without having a profound impact on the department and on the institution, but in particular on the department. And then during that time we had a number of people who had short stays in the department. The Englishman, I believe his last name is Neil. He and Dr. Minton shared an office. Claude Sturgill, one of the more interesting people we've had in this department was here, and he taught French history.

LH: The man who is over in Centre now.

PC: Oh, yea, Walter Nimmicks was here. And Walter...and let me say with the retirement of Ms. Egbert and Ms. Robertson there were some very good people who were brought into the department at that time and even though those who had been here for a long time were sure that the department was sunk, that it is the image remained really good. I forget to mention earlier in the summer of 58 John Minton came here

from Vanderbilt and I had a history class with him, and also had a history class that summer with Ms. Anderson. And I will long remember she said, "we have this young man in the department and he's real nice, but I don't think he knows much history." And she said that before the class. So we have met then some other weak people.

LH: I hope you have told him this.

PC: Several times. As a matter of fact, several students told him. And then of course you came in 66 or 7...

LH: 7.

PC: Harrington, or not Harrington, but Troutman came sometime about that period.

LH: He and I at the same time. Lucas was here the year before I came. Murphy.

PC: Murphy was here. So I guess the biggest change other than the retirement of those people is, like other departments, the size of the faculty was just growing very, very rapidly.

LH: Did you get one year there where the enrollment increased about a third?

PC: Yes, it was either 62 or 63. And that had a big impact on recruitment. And it was happening at all other institutions, so it was very difficult to find people. I think during that period of time some really good people brought into the history department, probably better than other departments in the university.

LH: I wouldn't argue that point.

PC: I think the biggest criticism I would have, not that you asked me to criticize, is we did not plan for areas of the discipline as well as we might have in recruiting faculty.

LH: Why not.

PC: I don't know. But I know one year we had about either three or four faculty members who were specialists in "civil war and history." Now there also was a point that there were areas where it was virtually impossible to recruit people. I mean some areas of history. We had, I guess in the early 70s, and you may recall the lady who, I believe, either had a degree or concentration was in oriental history or asian history, she had a good bit of work there.

LH: Are you thinking of Mooney?

PC: Yes. And of course east european.

LH: And we've lost a couple of people that we just couldn't keep in that area.

PC: Right. And of course John Bratchford came in that time.

LH: Paul, I think apart of these things is that considerable amount of recruiting was simply done on the basis of the person, without any regard for the specialty.

PC: Right, or any kind of master plan of where we were going or what we were looking for. And I think that is exactly right. And my observation is that wasn't restricted to the history department. That happened in some other areas.

LH: I was thinking of it in the general whole. I know Poteet kept trying to get me to come back here, and I said well, you have someone teaching in the areas that I want to be. He said "it makes no difference. Any historian can teach anything." I never quite concurred with that.

PC: I think he was using me as an example.

LH: Oh.

PC: Without regards to quality. There was another thing, Lowell, that was interesting to me about the recruitment of faculty and administrative people in, I guess, a big part of Dr. Thompson's era as president, and I've never heard him express this this way, but I had the feeling that either on paper or in his mind, that he had a list of people, who were Western graduates or he had identified somewhere along the way, that he was determined to get here. And early in his administration he worked on some of those, one of the individuals who comes to my mind is Dave Whitacker. IN the 60s when there was a decision to pull journalism out of English and make it a separate department, Dave Whitacker was the person who was going to be brought here. And to some people that was considered an impossible task, because he was at the Courier Journal and we weren't going to get him. But he came.

LH: Speaking of Kelly Thompson. Did you see much of him. Or work much with him as President.

PC: No. Well, now I was on the president's staff at the time he was president, but I had infrequent contact with him.

LH: Let's talk a little bit about him, however, because I'm sure you formed impressions about him as a faculty member and then as a member of the administrative staff. How would you assess him as president?

PC: I thought he was superb at presenting the case for the university and I don't have a lot of basis for judging that as far as Frankfort is concerned, and right now I guess now

that's how we tend to think about that one. But just to the external community I thought he was very good in presenting the university, of course he spoke well, still speaks well. He was certainly enthusiastic as far as the University is concerned, appeared to give an almost unbelievable amount of himself, not just his time but himself, to the university. Very, it seems to me from all of those standpoints, very, very positive. I guess I see in that a thing I think I see in some others, and that is the danger of identifying with the university so strongly that you can't separate yourself from the university and sometimes back off and look at it maybe as objective as you might. And that's a judgment without much informational basis. That's just an assessment I would have of him. The era in which he was president and he was probably an excellent for because it was a period of growth. And Dick Wilson and I were chatting some time back and Dick said that at least at the time he has written for the Courier Journal it seems to him for the point in time that public institutions in Kentucky very few exceptions have had the right person for the job at the time. And I think that's very true as far as Western and Dr. Thompson are concerned. I think for that period of time he was a superb person to be there.

LH: He was still very much in the Henry Hardin Cherry type of tradition.

PC: Very much so.

LH: I gather he's still quite paternalistic.

PC: Right. And at the faculty meetings, as I recall them, there would kind of be a combination of information that would be given out and really strong challenge. One of the things that, for some reason has stuck with me. One year, and this was an opening faculty, that is the opening of school year, he spoke on Shirttail instruction. And when I came the year it was unthinkable that a faculty member would go to class without a coat and tie on. When in the early 60s...

LH: Does that apply even to summer?

PC: Well, you might take your coat off in the summer, because, you know, I guess none of the classrooms were air conditioned. I can't think of a one that was. But you could take your coat off, but you always wore a necktie. Able to wear a coat and then maybe take it off. And he was perturbed that some people were letting their shirttails hang out and were untidy. And his point was that you teach not only what you teach in the subject matter but you teach a lot of other things that are less tangible but have an effect on the character of the students in your classes. That if you teach with your shirttail out, what kind of image you leave. And he was very, very serious about it. And there were some other people, in particular, what you and I might consider the old timers, one time when I was in the history department, I was sitting on the desk, and Dr. Poteet came by and saw me. When the class was over, he said "I want to see you." And he called me in his office and he said, "Young man, we're not going to have another Claude Sturgell in this department." Now Claude was a little unorthodox for the time.

He said "I don't ever want to see you seated on your desk anymore." And he didn't, because I just closed my door. So Dr. Thompson was quite motivational, and the interesting thing about it to me is there were people who made fun of it at the time. And now I hear people saying "We need a pat on the back." So maybe we're not ever satisfied with what we have, I don't know.

LH: Of course he did not have a strong academic background. Did he delegate authority in that area to Cravens, or what?

PC: That was one I was never sure of.

LH: And I'm still not sure of.

PC: Right. And I know, as I said, I was on Cravens' staff for a long time. Ray Cravens and I had a very close professional working relationship. In fact, unless he hid things that I never knew about, I worked on practically everything that went on in that office. I'm sure I did. And we would develop plans and proposals and he would take them to Dr. Thompson and he'd come back and we'd go on from there. I was never sure, quite sure, what position Dr. Thompson took on a lot of things. In other words, I don't know whether he said, "You've convinced me this is one we need to do." I don't know about the trade offs. In fact, my guess is as I look back on that that's the biggest unknown for me during that whole period. There are things, I think, Lowell, I've really been fortunate to have been in some of the roles I've been in here, in particular when you look at my credentials, and also in the period, because many, many of the things that we work with now, I was in place when the change occurred. And just as an illustration, the sabbatical weed program, I worked on. Well, we went through a lot of versions on that, and all that I would know is we would work on a lot of them and Dr. Cravens would take them to Dr. Thompson and come back. So I don't know what position Dr. Thompson took on a lot of those things. I know that when he became president, that particularly some of the old earth, strong academic types on campus were not supportive, because he came out of a public relations background.

LH: I think Stickles was probably one who felt that way.

PC: Right. And I don't know the answer to that.

LH: I was hoping you did. For a concrete example there, one of the things that attracted an enormous amount of public attention in his administration was the effort to get Kentucky Southern.

PC: Right.

LH: Now, what was his motive?

PC: I don't know. I was in Lexington going to school that year, and I picked up the Courier Journal and saw that.

LH: Well, I bet if you read either the Courier or the Lexington papers you got a different version from what was coming out of Western.

PC: That is a question that was not only germane then, but is now. Because if you read the strategic plan that the Council on Higher Education has just released...

LH: I have not read it.

PC: Well, you'll get one next week, maybe. The next version will be out. But anyway, they talk about the growth of the "Regional Schools." No reference is made to the fact that in 1960, one of the reasons that we grew, in particular Eastern to a lesser extent, was that we were serving large numbers of students out of Jefferson county. And that contributed to a great deal of our growth just as it has contributed to our flattening out of our current enrollment. Because Louisville is now serving those students. And had we been able to acquire Kentucky Southern, the whole configuration and public politics of higher education in Kentucky I think would be quite different. But obviously the power brokers were not going to let it happen. It's also interesting that one of the reasons that we allegedly could not do that was because that was a private school but we were a state school. U of L came into the state system and acquired Kentucky Southern. So it all depends on the perspective.

LH: It was a fascinating....

NEW TAPE - AUGUST 6, 1985

LH: Paul, were you surprised by President Thompson's resignation?

PC: I was not only surprised, I was shocked. That came at the end of my, near the end of my year and a half leave of absence. I picked up the Courier-Journal in Lexington and read about it. I had not been on campus for several weeks, I guess, and it did, and in case you have not interviewed him, it did not come as much of a shock to me as it did Bill Bivin. Bill Bivin had been persuaded by Dr. Thompson to leave his law school position at the University of Kentucky and take a position here. And shortly after that his retirement was announced.

LH: Well, I suppose a person has a right to reconsider the choices he's made.

PC: Well, I think he had resigned at the University of Kentucky.

LH: I'm thinking of Thompson.

PC: Oh, I see.

LH: Were you back here during the period then in which Downing was selected as president or were you still away?

PC: I had forgotten the sequence. I was away, but I was back here some because we were making arrangements to move back to Bowling Green, so I was here some, but primarily on the weekends, and did not have much interaction with people on campus.

LH: From what you know of this selection, were there any particular people, any particular groups that were especially pushy for his selection.

PC: The Board of Regents. I really don't know. As you know, the decision making in that period of time was much more closed than is the case now. I really knew very little about it, and of course the fact that I was gone most of the time.

LH: I had understood that there was no formal interview of any one by the entire Board.

PC: I had heard that.

LH: There were just little odd committees met here and there.

PC: Right.

LH: So Downing became president then. Let's talk a little bit about your relations with him. I would assume that you saw much more of him and the way he operated, the way he worked, then you did of Thompson.

PC: Oh, yes, because he become president sometime around the first of August, as I recall. I moved to his office in December, well I guess I actually started working there full time in January.

LH: How did that come about?

PC: I'm not sure. I got a call from him one night. He said something about what was I doing and wanted to know if I could come to the office and see him. And I said yes, since he was president I thought I probably could accommodate him. I got to his office and Harry Largden was there. And he asked me about moving to his office and serving as assistant to the president. And again, not meaning to be terribly redundant, but filling of positions was quite different then than now. And, of course, under Dr. Thompson Ms. Bates had carried the title of assistant to the president and the last several years he was president and that was the only staff person he had. Other than the second secretarial person or a secretarial person. So there was not, I guess in effect, any vacancy other

than the one Ms. Bates had, and when Mr. Downing moved from Vice President for, I guess he was vice president for administration, then.....

LH: I think so.

PC:to the presidency, Mary Sample, or Mary Hall, as she was then, moved with him and picked up the secretarial work and Marcella Brashear remained in the office. So I didn't know whether we were going to add anyone or not, in fact it hadn't occurred to me. In fact we talked about it, and I allowed that that was something I could be interested in. And the board approved it and I moved to his office.

LH: Now, how long were you in that position with that title before you changed?

PC: From January 70 to sometime in 1975, I forget the month in 75. So five years.

LH: So what happened then in 75?

PC: 75 I had a change in titles which included the responsibility of the university budget as well as some operating units that started reporting to me. The office that was then Grants and Contracts and is now known as Sponsored Programs, Institutional Research, and at that time all computing on campus. Since that time it has been divided and I have responsibility for administrative computing.

LH: So in those two capacities you worked very closely with President Downing all through his administration.

PC: Right, except for the first three or four months the entire length of it.

LH: Let's talk a little bit about his way of working. I think you said something last time we were talking about Thompson's inner circle. Did Downing use an inner circle?

PC: Yes, but he also, on a given issue, had an almost general practice of involving several people on it. But the inner circle, there certainly was one. I guess the most consistent participants in that would have been Bill Bivin, and Harry Largden, and me, and depending upon the issue, the academic vice president who was first Raymond Cravens and then later Jim Davis. And then John Minton who was during Dr. Downing's administration was named Vice president for, I believe, administrative affairs, was the title he had. And so those two, that is Cravens and Minton, I guess would weave in and out depending on the issue.

LH: How did Downing arrive at a decision. Let's say on some pretty difficult issue?

PC: One of the things that he did that probably was different from Dr. Thompson's approach, and is different from Dr. Zacharias' was to bring to his office many of the

participants and simply have a rather thorough discussion of it. And take the information that was at hand, the views of the people there, and either make a decision in that setting or take all that information and then make a decision subsequently.

LH: Did he like to take time to arrive at a decision?

PC: He studied issues frequently, the major ones, over some time, yes.

LH: That was the impression that I had, certainly. We'll come back and talk about a number of issues during his administration, but somewhat summarize up his decade in the presidency. What would you see, looking back at those years, as his strong points.

PC: Oh, I think his strengths, and this may be more introspective than you want to be, he was and is, as far as that's concerned, but since we're dealing with his term of president, he was a very diligent individual, very hard worker, as a staff person I appreciated very much that he didn't ask me to do anything that he either hadn't done or wouldn't do. In fact, frequently did things that he should have put off on the rest of us. So certainly one of his strengths was his willingness to work and his capacity to carry a big load. Another strength, undoubtedly, at least in my mind, is his devotion to the institution, his strong identification with the institution, and one in which, in my opinion, if he didn't get a bum rap, he wasn't probably assessed. And that is that he really has a strong view about the quality of the programs of the institution, the faculty and the students. And I think sometimes that one became diluted because at the same time he has a great compassion for individuals. And there might be a student whose record was not very good, but in that individual he saw something he thought was worth revealing, and he would maybe encourage those who were making decisions about readmission to give the person a chance. As a result, there are those who felt he diluted the standards. And I didn't view it that way. I think it was more of two different interests, that sometimes were difficult to reconcile. During his administration, with the exception of one or two of us, he probably did a pretty good job in bringing people to some key positions. And there are a couple of us who are probably suspect in that regard. I would be one of them.

LH: Should I raise an objection or should we just go on?

PC: Just go ahead. I wouldn't identify anyone, but.... I would view those as some of his strong points.

LH: Alright, what about areas of weakness?

PC: Some of those have flip sides to them. His devotion to the institution, I think, could be viewed by some and was, as a provincial approach that kept the institution from expanding as it should. He was criticized sometimes for getting involved in too much of the detail of decision making, and as a result vice presidents maybe passed things on to

them that maybe they should have made the decisions on. And again, those are matters of style, and sometimes, I think the reason he did that was that he was aggravated that a decision hadn't been made on something, so he just got a group together on it and get it made. So that one cuts both ways. He also had a view that you do your job and you do it well and you work hard. I guess somewhat the Christian ethics. And the PR it going to take care of itself. And as a result he was not given to letting the world, even the campus sometimes, know about what he was doing. I think for two reasons. One, as I said, he thought if you did your job it would be apparent. And the other is he did not anyone to think he was promoting himself. The weakness that I see in that is that there is a rather strong identification of the president and the institution. And a couple of times it's difficult to separate those. So if you don't have a promotion of what the president is doing, sometimes you don't have a promotion of the institution. And I think he sometimes got criticism when I knew that he was working on something, but because he was reluctant to take credit and to involve himself with the media, that he was criticized for not doing anything. So I suppose, in a sense, that could be taken as a criticism.

LH: What about his health?

PC: His health was good. He had a kidney stone problem from time to time, and that was always clear in my mind because I was with him one day when he had a kidney stone attack, and he said "Now you are going to think that I'm dying." And I did. It was the first time and only time that I had been around anyone who had a kidney stone attack. And he said "I'm going to be alright." And of course the lingering problem he had was a sinus problem. And I don't suppose anyone who has terminated from sinus.

LH: You just wish that you would. I know I've seen him at meetings when I suffered simply from seeing him.

PC: Right, but I don't think it had, it was not debilitating and it would not have upset his energy, I don't think.

LH: OK, let's look for a moment at his relationship with the faculty.

PC: OK, could I go back to one of the great strengths? His wife. I would not, I told him shortly after I started working in his office, that whether he was the president or not was not as much as a question as whether his wife was the first lady. I think she was a tremendous asset to him.

LH: I would certainly agree to that.

PC: As is true with many of us.

LH: This is in case Rose is listening.

PC: That's right, if Rose ever hears this tape.

LH: Let's look for a moment on his relationship with the faculty. One of the things I heard often expressed in connection with his administration is that he never really understood the faculty point of view.

PC: I'm not sure that I would express it that way. I think that is correct that that was frequently stated. And there are two or three things about that. Number one, and I would probably put this number one, has to do with his nature. I had viewed Mr. Downing, and still do, as a humble individual, insisted on not having an earned degree. He sometimes felt that faculty might question his academic background. I had said to him, and believed it, was the only reason he didn't is because he didn't take the time to get it. I think he certainly had the ability to earn a graduate degree. So I think that was a factor. And whoever listens to this tape down the road may not understand this next statement, probably, and it needs to be in the right context. In my opinion, he was not real comfortable with many members of the faculty, just as he was not comfortable with some of the media. Maybe with the media in general. And there were certain faculty members that he was not comfortable with. And I don't know the reason for that. One of the things that characterized him, and still does, is that he's a fairly frank individual, and if you ask him what he thinks about something, he will tell you. If you don't want to know, you shouldn't ask. And I think, sometimes in interacting with faculty, it was not easy for any of them to resist the temptation to express to faculty what he thought about certain things. His teaching experience at the University was limited, having been, I guess, totally at the training school. So having not come out of a faculty position at the university, that was a disadvantage to him. And then the fact, as I said earlier, that he was not real sharing with people on what he was working on. Then I think there is another thing, Lowell, and that is that I view his administration in many ways as a transition here. And I think to remember, that he was a staff member and a vice president during a period of time in which governance was not shared. Governance was almost totally in the hands of the board and the chief executive, in the hands of the president. And he, in many ways, he made that transition, given that background, I think rather well.

LH: But so very frequently reluctantly.

PC: Oh, well, probably yes.

LH: One example that I can think of off hand was his opposition, for example, to having votes for the faculty and student regent. He was on record time after time as seeing no point of that.

PC: But that was true of all the presidents in the state of Kentucky, I think, as I recall.

LH: I imagine certainly a good majority of them.

PC: Right.

LH: I think one of the particular problems in relation to the faculty was the faculty senate.

PC: I think that's correct.

LH: Which, of course, had two dimensions. One is simply the governance, which we were talking about. And the other, perhaps, the personality conflict with the first chair.

PC: Probably. Again, there is a conflict, though, that should not be lost sight of here. In 1965, as I recall, the academic council came into being. Up until that time there had been what was known as the curriculum committee. And the curriculum committee primarily were the heads. And at that time, as you know, they didn't have a lot of heads. The librarian, and the registrar, and three or four other people. So I suspect I could not site any direct statement on this for Mr. Downing was part of all that structure. And he saw us move from a curriculum committee to an academic council, which in the minds of some people, was a fairly gigantic step in governance. Even though the academic council did not have that much to do with governance. It did, as you know, with curriculum matters. So that did occur. We did also, by the time we got into the probably second or third year of Mr. Downing's administration, much more faculty involvement on committees. And I think another thing that conditions that is, as you will recall, in the late 60s or early 70s, there was a great deal of unrest in the country, including this campus, and probably for some "hardliners" and I'm not suggesting that Mr. Downing was a hardliner, I'm not taking a position on that at this point, but there were those who were saying "Democracy's gone too far in this country already, just look at what's happened to us." So I think the context of what was going on was a factor, and then since you were involved in it, certainly the reaction of the members of the board, was a very definite factor. And even though I worked closely with the members of his staff, I did not have a full appreciation of how much pressure he was getting from board members on each of those issues. I certainly did on some of them. There were some board members during their period of time who were not real happy with the thing called the faculty senate.

LH: As well as a number of other

PC: And I don't know how you voted on that.

LH: Well, you can interview me some other time on that. I saw a figure a while back that I think perhaps illustrates part of this point. I think that by 1970 over 80% of the faculty had come since 1960. It was a much different faculty from what had existed in an earlier period, that he and Thompson and all had been accustomed to.

PC: That figure may be right, I can't recall the figure right now, but as you know, well when you look at those of us who are here now, there are a few who came in their late 50s, and the rest of us have come since 1960. And when you look at the size of the faculty in the 50s and the size of the 70s, a big portion had to come after about 1960 because that's when the growth was so rapid.

LH: Since we've mentioned the board of regents, let's talk about his relationship with the board. Is it your understanding that Dr. McCormack was one of his strong supporters in the selection process?

PC: As a matter of fact, and you may correct me on this, but I believe that Dr. McCormack's service on the board was in two different periods of time. That his reappointment to the second period of service was shortly before Mr. Downing was named president. And, oh yes, he was a very staunch supporter.

LH: Well, what went wrong.

PC: Oh, I don't know, I have some thoughts on these, and I would reemphasize that these are not necessarily based on fact, but everybody saw them, observation views. I think the one thing that, again you have to think about the context of the board of regents. For a long, long time the board here was made up of what, four members and maybe five. And the chairman of the board, by the statute, was the superintendent of public instruction. That continued on until the early 70s. So one of the two major things that I think happened with regard to the composition of the board, the influence, the relationship between Mr. Downing and the board. One is the superintendent of public instruction moved, which meant that the board would select their own chairman. Now up to that time that board had selected a vice chairman to preside when the superintendent of public instruction was not there. But that was a fairly insignificant role compared to the chairmanship later. So that's one thing that changed. Secondly was the number of board members was increased. And then I said two. And then the third thing was the addition of the faculty and student regent, with the election of a chairman. That was a new venture, as far as the board, and as far as the president was concerned. Dr. McCormack was elected chairman in, I guess, some of us were on the staff at the time, along with the president, could be criticized for not having provided more orientation for the members of the board during that period of time. And what the board member was to do, the role of a chairman, so I think just simply changes in the role of the board and the chairman of the board was a factor. Maybe Dr. McCormack not totally seeing himself as a board member dealing with policy but as a person who maybe was a little more involved with the day-to-day operations in conjunction with the president. So I think that was the root of some of the problems. Then as you know we entered into a period where we developed an open house policy. The residence halls, and I am of the opinion that Dr. McCormack felt like he was dealt with, if not dishonestly, unfairly there. Because I really believe that he felt that the president and maybe some of those in student affairs had misled him in how that was to be implemented. And I'm not saying

that he did, but I think on both sides I think there was a misconception. And that probably was a big factor in that. A third thing probably has to do with basketball and a desire to have some changes in the basketball coach in the 70s, you remember after going to the final four, that we had a change in the head basketball coach for men. We had an NCAA penalty, two penalties that were pretty strong and problems in recruiting and some individuals who came in to play who created some problems in the community, and all of those were factors that I think influenced the relationship between Dr. McCormack and president Downing.

LH: Of course one of the examples that you would have of the sort of pressures you were talking about a moment ago, the counter pressures, on this open visitation, would be the student demand for the doors to close.

PC: The president, and in particular the staff and students would make one kind of recommendation to the president for things that were maybe more in line with the desire of the student, and it ought to be remembered that a member of the board was a student at this time. And we had, as you will recall, some student members who were fairly political, in my opinion they were very political. They were rather political....

LH: By Western standards at any rate.

PC: Right. And all of this, I think in the concept in which we operate, they were very political. So I think you were exactly right, that is one area where if you please one constituency, you alienate some others. But that's generally the nature of the presidency.

LH: What about the support then that McCormack had on the board? Because we are entering into a period here where probably in the first time of Western's board, there are not unanimous votes.

PC: That's correct. As you know, there was certainly a division. There were several board meetings in which the board was not united on many issues that became before the board, plus there was, as we talked about on the last tape, the open meetings law had taken effect at this time, and these meetings had to be conducted in open. As a result of that, the world knew about the divisions. Of course the records, the minutes show how the votes were. And there was a division. I'm not sure when you say how, when you say how was he supported. I don't know exactly how to answer that.

LH: At least in part by the medical profession.

PC: Well, yes.

LH: Which usually lined up pretty firmly on one side.

PC: The medical profession, and we had, as you know, in the 70s, we went through two professions. We had a board for a while that was dominated by doctors, at least four of them, I think, at one time. And then following that we had a high number of lawyers on the board.

LH: How did the board change in the relationship of the board with the president during the latter part of his administration?

PC: I've forgotten whose term expired when Julian Carroll appointed John David Cole to the board and Mr. Cole was elected chairman. And I think that was, again, represented a shift in the board in that there was not a feeling as fair as the board was concerned. But Mr. Cole was fairly effective in my opinion in getting the board to deal more with policy issues and less with personalities and dealing less with personalities and personal differences with the president. And I'm not saying that Mr. Cole was a staunch supporter of Mr. Downing, but he I think was effective in getting the board to function more as, I think, a board should function.

LH: Wasn't it during that period where there was, well, most of the committees were formed, was built in.

PC: Yes, up until that time I think there was only one committee in the board and that was executive committee. And yes Mr. Cole started that, and I think that's again, one of the positive things that he contributed to the board.

LH: I believe another thing perhaps, Paul, and I guess Bill Bivin did much of that, going back through the minutes of the board to find out what the situation.....

PC:codification of the policies that the board had approved over a period of time and that was a major advancement. And then the Board, during that period of time, and some prior to that had started looking at a number of policies some of which had been existent for a number of years such as tenure and promotion, rank policies sort of thing. Those were reviewed and incorporated in the bylaws of the Board.

LH: I think that would perhaps be a good example of the sort of thing you mentioned earlier that Downing seldom got credit for.

PC: Yea.

LH: But most of those policies were adopted during his administration.

PC: I think all of them were. Since 1979 there had been some revisions, but the current policies that much of our day-to-day activity is governed by occurred during that period.

LH: In addition to the board of regents occupying a more active role, so did the Council on Higher Education. Why don't you talk a bit about relationships with the council during the 70s.

PC: Two or three things that are highlights. One is the role of the presidents in the council became a factor. The presidents, well if you go way back and I assume you will cover this in other areas, but Kentucky has one of the oldest coordinating bodies in the United States. And the presidents had been a key factor in that.

LH: Some would say THE key factor.

PC: Some would say the dominant factor in that. In fact that's what was there and doing. It also should be noted that Kentucky had some presidents who some would say were outspoken and some would say were a right good spokesman for their institution. And I guess notable in that would have been Thompson, Dorin and Martin. In Mr. Downing's approach to things, again, showed up there and that is that he frequently did not speak freely at the council meetings. It was not his style and as a result when the reporters wrote up the record of the council meetings that appeared in newspapers and all other media outlets, he was not quoted a great deal. As a result there were some on campus who felt that he was not getting the message of Western across. And that's a mixed bag, because, as you know, that's not the only way you get your message across. Mr. Downing had an excellent relationship with people in Frankfort and with the leaders in the state agencies, but he was more inclined to work quietly with those individuals as opposed to working in the public eye. But the Council did begin to change and I guess it was just before he left office that the presidents were no longer permitted to go on the Council of Higher Education. For years they had been and that has very much changed the dynamics of the involvement of the presidents with the Council on Higher Education. So there was that change, then the Council, the role of the Council has expanded some. For example, construction projects valued at over \$200,000 had to be approved by the Council, a number of other things that placed the Council in a more active role with the individual institutions.

LH: Approval, academic approval...

PC: Yes, that was

LH:gradually moving into that.

PC: That's right. And that certainly increases the role of the Council and the management of the institutions.

LH: How did you feel President Downing viewed such trends as that?

PC: Very much opposed to them.

LH: Just as a matter of principle or application or what?

PC: Probably both, but principle in that he felt that those were matters that should be dealt with at a campus level as opposed to a state level. And that when you have an agency in Frankfort doing that, making those kind of decisions, then you don't have the involvement of the people on campus.

LH: Did the formulation of the Mission Statements come during his administration?

PC: In the last year, and I think that is another major factor. In my opinion, and there a lot of people that disagree with this. There was a lot of huffing and puffing about the mission statement, and I really think the Council kind of burst a grasshopper, but there was a lot of concern on each one of the campuses, and the impact of the mission statements in the years since, I think that was 1977 when those were first discussed and maybe finalized in 78....

LH: That's about the period, I'm sure.

PC: ...the impact of those, in my opinion, has been much more limited than the Council thought they would be. I think primarily because the mission statements as outlined by the institution were not tied to the funding mechanism. And about the only way they had to implement those is through the approval process, as far as degree programs were concerned.

LH: What about Downing's relationship with Harry Snyder?

PC: Well, how about with Peggy Albright first?

LH: Alright.

PC: The Council, as I recall, has only had three executive directors. Ted Gilbert, who was there when Mr. Downing first began president...

LH: Gilbert was in and out with the times.

PC: Right. But when I first started working in the president's office there were four staff members, plus two secretarial people at the council. And that was in 1970 and now there are about 50. But the relationship with Gilbert was good, the relationship with Albright was good, and good is not a very descriptive term. But generally the ability to sit down and talk through matters was there, and Albright was receptive to the different views and was pretty good at trying to keep everybody halfway happy. Plus there were not some of the issues that we have now. When Snyder became executive, Harry Snyder became executive director of the Council, of course Mr. Downing and others of us had known him for a while, and that relationship was kind of off and on. There were one or

two issues in which Mr. Downing felt that Harry Snyder had misled us. One being the program in Owensboro and funding for the program in Owensboro and who was going to have that responsibility. So that one is one that, and I guess this has been true of most people's relationship with Snyder--it ran hot and cold and some days he'd feel that he got a good hearing with him and other days he didn't.

LH: From what I've heard that could be the setup with any of the presidents.

PC: I think that's correct. Only right now there are two or three that we'd say it was all cold.

LH: True. What about relationships with the University of Kentucky? Because I have discovered through the university records that UK had frequently through the years tried to keep Western from doing things that Western thought should be done, graduate work for example.

PC: Yes, going away with that? Yes. That one again is a little difficult to respond to without trying to go back and look at some of the things in the record. There certainly was some competition between Western and the University of Kentucky. And when the presidents had the vote on the Council, my remembrance of that is that President Downing did not always vote in support of things that UK advocated. However, the presidents usually, and again, the record might prove this statement incorrect, but I don't think it will, the presidents usually found some way to support when it came down to the vote the position of the other institution. In fact that's one of the things that probably, among others, led to the presidents to be removed from the Council. That they always voted together against everybody else. But the relationship with the University of Kentucky again was a mixed situation. There were a number of things where an effort was made to work with them, the cooperative doctoral program is one of them. And in many cases I guess just an effort to stay away from them and them stay away from us.

LH: What about the relationship to our sister institutions--Murray, Eastern, Morehead in particular.

PC: I would cite two of those with particular note. I think when Dill Curtis came to Murray more competitiveness, and I'm certainly not talking about athletics, developed between Western and Murray.

LH: You're referring perhaps to the Owensboro situation.

PC: Well, Owensboro is one of them and as I mentioned earlier that's one where President Downing thought that Harry Snyder was maybe not totally above board with it. The other, a lot of competition developed between Murray and Western in recruiting in the area between the geographic area between Murray and Bowling Green. And in particularly counties like Hopkins, Muhlenburg, Christian, those roughly halfway between

the two institutions. Just a general posturing of the two institutions, there was a little bit of competition. And then between Eastern and Western, pretty good relationships between the staff. But then again there was some competition for funding. And it's during the later part of Mr. Downing's administration, the early 80s, I forget which, I believe it was the late 70s, enrollment of Eastern surpassed the enrollment of Western. As a result that effected how the state people would give funding to the state institutions. A little bit, but not a great deal.

LH: I remember too, Paul, that a point that Downing occasionally brought up with the President of Eastern on budget is that you have gone so heavily in debt in the state, can you explain that?

PC: It had to do with the physical plan and the debt service and the interest and principle had to be paid on the buildings on campus and yea, at one time, Mr. Downing had a little card that he carried around in his pocket that had on it the names of the institutions, as I recall, the enrollment and the amount of debt service, that is the annual payment on the debt. And when he was with the governor or somebody else he would show them that and show them that we were a more prudent in that regard. One of the things that I should have said earlier about Mr. Downing, he truly felt that he was a steward, and I've heard him use that expression, of the resources that the state of Kentucky had placed here. And he felt that the decisions that were made about the expenditures of funds, should be made with the same care and consideration that you gave to spending your own money. And he would point out that Eastern ran up this big debt and therefore it ought to be taken into consideration when the annual operating appropriations were made.

LH: Since we've gotten over into the budget, let's talk a little bit about fiscal affairs. What were the major changes that occurred in that area?

PC: In the Downing years? Well, just a tremendous change in the budget. No, No. Strike that from the transcript. I think there is a change with regard to budgeting practices that parallels some other changes in that period of time. And that is that the budgeting process became much more open than it had been. That's probably further related to the budget director. But then again it's related to the entire atmosphere of the 70s and what was going on on campus and a lot more people were involved in what was taking place and we not only had the open meetings law, but you may recall it was during that period of time that the open records law was passed. And we, as far as I know, were not adamant about saying to people that before you can see this information you have to fill out a form. So one of the things that happened is that people had more access to the budget and financial information. I might say that one of the most disappointing things that happened when I became director of the budget, I did not find the big pot of money. I had heard all through the years that first Downing and Thompson, and then Downing and Largden, had a big pot of money. And if they did it's still hidden. So I have never found the big pot of money.

LH: Well, keep looking.

PC: We certainly could use it.

LH: How would you describe the general state of our fiscal affairs during that period?

PC: I would describe them at number one very solid. Mr. Downing first as vice president of business affairs was what I would describe as a prudent manager. He was a person that others had described as being conservative, and that's probably accurate. There was a good bit of margin built into the budget. That is there were ample margins built in that is the difference between income and expenditure. And we usually ended the year with pretty good reserve carried forward. And he was very careful about the expenditure of funds. As a matter of fact, one year we had more money to put into salaries than the board would agree to put into salaries. And I don't know whether you picked that up elsewhere or not, but that is a fact. And the board said, "No, we're only going at a certain percentage." I don't remember what it was, I think five percent, maybe it's 5.8 on salaries. And we had more money that could have been put into salaries.

LH: Those were the good old days.

PC: Now that really helped when President Zacharias got here and we started the budget cuts. Those were underway at the president's arrival, it just happened they coincided. That we had some reserves that we do not now have. It really made it a lot easier for us to get through the first biennium of budget reductions.

LH: Hadn't we had at least one or two fairly minor budget reductions during the Downing period--one percent, one and one tenth percent, or something like that?

PC: Yes. I think, though, the first one of those was the Thompson years when, let's see Brevitt was followed by Nunn. When Nunn took office in January of 67, I believe that would be right, there was a budget reduction. I was on Cravens staff, and I remember a group of us being called to the Regents Room at the administration building and questions asked on how we were all going to deal with it. As I recall the reduction for Western was like \$580,000, which was a substantial reduction then. I don't remember what our state appropriation would have been, but probably less than \$20 million and that's a sizeable reduction.

LH: Were there any trends during the Downing period in the sources of income, that is, did the state support remain fairly constant?

PC: As a percentage? Probably. For one reason, tuition did not rise a great deal during that period. Not like it has in the 80s. As a result, state appropriation probably remained a fairly constant as a percentage. Now this, the percentage of dollars, of the total state budget, that went to higher education, increased in the early 70s. In fact it

reached a peak, as I recall, in 1974, about 20% of the total state appropriations, about 20% of it went to higher education. And it's now down to about 16. So that was a trend that affected all of us. The other trend that started in that period, again, is external to our campus is that U of L came into the state system and Northern was made, the community college at Northern was made a four-year institution. So there were two additional institutions to be supported out of a smaller percentage of the state appropriations. So those strains occurred.

LH: And of course I think we mentioned this previously in the case of U of L the adverse effect on our enrollment increased.

PC: Oh, yes, very definitely. Two things happened in Jefferson county. That was one. The Jefferson Community College continued to grow and they reached a peak of about 6,000. Now they're not that large now. And the other is that Eastern began to recruit a larger number of students out of Jefferson County than they had in a long time.

LH: We haven't really, just touched upon it, but we ought to come back, I think, a moment, to student relations during the decade. You have mentioned the student unrest before. What forms did that take?

PC: Oh to those of us at the time, violent forms. But obviously it wasn't very violent.

LH: No major buildings were burned?

PC: No major buildings. The worst thing we had, I guess two things come to my mind. The one was the near confrontation in the Downing Center between a group of blacks and white students, and the other one was an effort by a group of black students to sit in in the administration building. And, as you know, some wouldn't think the latter was all bad. The context, though, of that whole situation had to do, not so much with black/white issues, as it did with the unrest that was characteristic of the nation, particularly people of that age, college age, going out to situations in Vietnam, out of what some viewed as a high-handed way in which authorities were showing their strength on the national level. And of course it reached a peak in many places with the event at Kent State. And we had a group of people, you may recall, on campus called the Volunteers who donned military apparel. There were about a half a dozen of us who, as I recall, for about two weeks spent almost night and day on campus. And it wasn't that so much occurred, it was just that it was always the possibility of some kind of a major occurrence. We also did not have a public safety force, like we now have. As a matter, as you may recall, that's one of the genesis for the current public safety force that we now have. That and some board members' concern about drug abuse and misuse. Then the other thing that is certainly of not great significance, but is very vivid in my mind. Near the end of this phase, if that's what it was, streaking became popular. And we had a lot of streakers on campus. And for some reason it always occurred at night. And again, a number of us were here at night to do something with regard to the streakers.

I'm not sure what it was we were going to do. We did not catch any of them. But Lazarus, Ray Lazarus, and Charlie Keouwn, Owen Lawson, John Minton, Lee Robertson, I'm probably leaving out one or two, of us spent a lot of time here during that period of time.

LH: I can just see you chasing them down the Russellville Pike.

PC: Well, you may not want to take much time on your tape, but I remember being back of the administration building on Russellville Road one night and there was a group of students gathered by the caution light. And the reason they were there, someone got an idea that they gathered there some others would drive down the street and moon them. So that was occurring, and about that time, someone hollered "Looky there," and a streaker ran from the Kentucky building up across the campus toward VanMeter. And he reminded me of a gazelle. He was going at a fairly rapid place and just kind of hitting the aisle spots. And it seems to me like someone took out after him but I don't think they caught him.

LH: You would feel then that our radicals of that period in the student body were perhaps not too terribly radical in circumspect?

PC: Certainly, when you looked at the national picture they were not in any retrospect they were not. It was, I think, the national scene set the tone a great deal. And there was concern, you know it was during that period when the, what was it the Air Force ROTC building at UK was burned. And that created some anxiety. And then there was the ill will that surfaced, racial ill will that surfaced some. It primarily, as I recall, came up over cheerleaders. And that had the potential to create a bad situation.

LH: And then a voting situation, do you remember?

PC: Right.

LH: Which more ballots were cast then voters. And it had to be rerun. And I remember the polls were closed for an hour or two there.

PC: I had forgotten that. That's right. And it, so there were some very tense times. In fact one of the interesting scenes, and it's more interesting I guess as time passes, was when the large number of black students gathered in the administration building and Mr. Downing made a passionate speech to them. And by passionate, I really mean that. I shed a tear. And it was not through fear, even though some may have misunderstood that, but it had to do, as he expressed, it was his concern for the institution and what this kind of thing did to the institution. I think more than anything else there was the potential during that period of time for problems.

LH: Another one I recall came up was the matter of outside speakers on campus. And our Louisville imports and the injunction.

PC: Yes, and of course we also had during that period of time the hearing over, I guess that was a hearing, over whether the movie could be shown on campus or not. The Fly, that's correct. In going back to our earlier conversation about policies, as you may recall, we have a speaker's policy that grew out of that period of time.

LH: I was chair of that committee. I remember it vividly.

PC: That's correct, my apologies.

LH: And to the best of my knowledge, it's never actually been implemented, has it?

PC: Oh, with the preacher down at the Downing Center it is occasionally. However he doesn't always want to speak in the exact location some of us selected. But I suppose if things cycle, as they usually do, in another ten years we may, they may be into this kind of a scene again.

LH: Paul, those are most of the questions I have on the Downing period. Any other comments or so forth before we move on?

PC: I suppose just one and I made the comment something like this earlier. And that is that I have used the Downing era as really a transition period from a period of time in which things were done in what might be described as the old ways--more meetings were closed and you were only here for a short period of time of Dr. Thompson's administration. But when there were major appointments of people, those were not usually announced at the board meeting. There would be gathering of the faculty. I remember one time that there were 16 of us lined up in front of the stage in VanMeter. I wasn't sure what they were going to be executed or what. And I had some kind of very minor title, I can't tell you what it was. And there were 16 of us lined up there from people who had been appointed to department heads to whatever kind of role I was in then. And those were kind of the vehicle orchestrated and brought to a crescendo in that kind of a setting. So we've gone in the ten years we went from that to almost total open meetings. Maybe not, but almost total. And as a result of that there were a number of people who had to learn how to function in a different kind of atmosphere. And I think Mr. Downing was one of those kind of people. So it was a transition from that standpoint. It was also another factor that I think should not be lost. In the period of time Mr. Downing was president, which was about a decade, there was not a building on campus named for an individual. Again, I think that was sort of symbolic of his approach to things. During that period of time, buildings generally climaxed, or terminated, I guess, rather than climaxing. There was a good bit of building during his administration, but it concluded also during his administration. Enrollment reached a peak during his administration. So we moved out of one phase of the life of the

university into another. And it certainly set a stage for, as it turned out, President Zacharias coming in. And in many of the things that I think we needed to get out of our system, we got out of our system, and maybe made it easier for President Zacharias to function.

LH: Were you surprised by President Downing's resignation?

PC: No.

LH: Had you seen it coming for some time?

PC: Oh, yes. I think it was an open secret that there were some board members who wanted him out. He called Bill Bivin and me into his office one day and he said "I just want to tell you all that I'm stepping down." And he said "You reach a point in time when you say that it's time to give it up." And he said, "And I've reached that point." And I think that he had. And that's not to take away from him. His energies had pretty well been sapped and it had been a difficult period of time. Not only for him, but for the country and for higher education. And I think that, as I told him then, personally I hate to see him step down, but I think it was best for him and best for the institution.

LH: Anything you want to in comment in the period between presidents--Minton's tenure?

PC: Probably very anxious period. It turned out, in many ways, to be, that turned out to be a year.

LH: One year.

PC: I thought it was a right good year, and I think part of it was those who had burs under their saddle either got rid of them or

THIS IS AUGUST 13, 1985 AND THIS IS A CONTINUATION OF THE INTERVIEW WITH DR. PAUL COOK.

LH: Paul, let's talk a little bit about the search for the president that resulted in Zacharias coming to the campus. Weren't you one of the names that was dropped in the pot?

PC: I think that's a good way to describe it. Yes I was.

LH: What are your comments on the search process that took place then? This is right pertinent at the moment. Looking back at it.

PC: I was going to say it really brings back memories I'd just as soon not relive.

LH: Such as?

PC: Such as having a search. Well, let me go to the conclusion of the results or of the search or the results of it. As I have said to Don Zacharias a number of times, based on the complications that developed in it, I think the institution was extremely lucky that we ended up with Don Zacharias because there were so many glitches and halts in the process that I think it could have fallen apart, particularly in the closing weeks of it. As I talked with Dave Cole, who was, as you know, then chairman of the board, Dave continued to say that it was an excellent process and would hold up against anything that might come along. I told him that the institution and the board was just lucky as it turned out. I think on paper the process was set up to function well and my observation about some of the breakdowns in it is, and I would be hard pressed to give you a lot of evidence, and some that I know of I would not give you, frankly, so is that there are people who acted unprofessional and were trying to benefit themselves in the search process. And I think those were major factors in some of the glitches that developed.

LH: I take it you're not going in any more detail on that point.

PC: I would think that was accurate.

LH: It seemed to me that one of the weaknesses was the fact that the board did not have enough faith in its screening committee. As I remember, they required about 20 names to be turned over to them.

PC: Right. That's the number that I recall.

LH: When it should have been only 8 or something like that.

PC: I think so.

LH: Did you see any particular value in the aspect of the procedure that sent a visiting team to the campuses of the finalists?

PC: Well, I cannot, since I....first of all, maybe I should state, Lowell, that as a member of the president's staff at that time, I tried to stay rather far removed from the process. As a result, I can't speak to that point, I suppose, with much validity. I had some views about it, and my views are that that potentially opened up an opportunity for people to get involved personally in maybe trying to cut deals for themselves. The other aspect of it is, I believe the same candidate information can be required through well placed telephone calls. And I know in the case of President Zacharias' interview and discussions with people at Mississippi State it had gone on in recent days prior to his accepting the job there that they did a considerable search as far as he was concerned, his performance, how he was viewed within the community and within the state. And that was all done by telephone.

LH: You remember one of the rather amusing things, I think, that occurred was when a visiting team went to California and did not discover that the person there was in the process of being dismissed.

PC: Yes, I do remember that.

LH: Which makes one remember a little bit about the validity of the process.

PC: Yea, I think again that's something that could have been discovered by telephone.

LH: Did you, granted that you weren't closely involved in it, did you have the feeling that the board was perhaps thinking in terms of off campus in the beginning.

PC: I don't think there's any question what that was the case.

LH: That was certainly the impression I had, too.

PC: I also have an observation that if you'd like to have it. I think it was a point in the history of the university when that needed to occur.

LH: Of course we had one case of that before.

PC: I assume you're talking about president Garrett?

LH: Right.

PC: Yes, the method in which he was selected by no history correctly, was a little different than this process.

LH: The Garrett search was briefer.

PC: Much briefer and involved fewer people.

LH: Paul, among the many things that came up, there were two names in particular, and if you want to comment on those or not. One would be the Alexander situation.

PC: I cannot comment very much. I may have met Kern along the way, but I do not remember it. I can't remember whether it's know or knew, I can't remember if his father is still living or not. But I knew his father for a number of years. In that probably, Lowell, was so much mythology associated with that. And if mythology is not the right word, certainly so much comment on campus. But I don't know what the facts were and what the rumors were about that, but there were a number of people here who's rate of their heart beat escalated because they saw the possibility of some changes on campus,

personnel changes, if Kern Alexander came. And may even have seen themselves associated with that.

LH: The other name was that of Farlan.

PC: Yes. Jean Farlan, of course, at that time was a professor in the department, I think it was still the department of educational leadership then, and Jean has some brothers-in-law who are very, very forceful in the democratic party in the state of county, and specifically Pulaski County. And there were some people who, and I'm not saying it was his brothers-in-law, but there were people in the political realm who pushed very hard to get Jean Farlan's name considered and it's my understanding to make sure that he got in the final group.

LH: As I recall, Zacharias said that he was about to drop out of the race, that if a decision had not been made when it was he probably would have.

PC: He has said that to me since he has been here. That if there had been one more glitch in it he probably would have withdrawn because there was so much confusion that he obviously was not sure what was going on.

LH: So he is selected as president then. What about your relationship with him. Of course in the position you had been in, working with Downing, I suppose it would raise the question or whether or not the new president wanted someone else.

PC: It certainly would. First of all, I had met Don Zacharias a few years before when he had visited this campus in conjunction with something that I believe Paul Corts did. I had forgotten who it was, but I believe it was Paul. And Paul invited me to a meeting, there were probably four or five of us there, because Don, at that time, was the on the president's staff in Texas, and he and I had, generally, a similar position. And I was not only impressed with him, then, but we just seemed to establish some mutual understandings, and I guess part of it because we had a similar kind of job. When Don was named president, I obviously was fairly close to some of the early dealings. Again, let me emphasize, not the selection but once he was named, because I was in the president's office at the time. And, as noted, Dr. Minton was acting president, which meant he would phase out and go back to his other role. And I was interested in remaining in touch with the administration, and told Don when he got here, I suppose told is a rather strong word, I guess asked to talk to him about the situation. And I did say to him that I realize that a president should be able to select his staff. And even though I was interested in staying, I realize he ought to have a choice in who he wanted to work in his office. And the thing I remember him saying that is generally what he said, and it may not be exactly right, was that "Well, let's work a little bit and see how it works out." And from my perspective, he may have it entirely differently, but from my perspective, we've had an extremely good chemistry and have the same, generally the

same approach to a lot of things. And it has been an extremely rewarding personal and professional association for me.

LH: What's his work mode, Paul. How does it differ, for example, from Downings?

PC: Well, let me speak in general and you may want to direct it in some way. First of all, I would say that I was impressed, or had been impressed with the capacity for both of them as far as work was concerned. And I hope we never have a president who didn't have that capacity, because I don't think you can be successful without that. Their styles are obviously different, and that's not to say one's right and one's wrong, they're quite different. And that can go all the way from a matter of things to others. For example, President Downing usually was an early riser and got to the office early. In fact he was frequently the first person in the office. And a lot of times was the last person to leave in the afternoon. President Zacharias may not rise as early, I have never seen him get up except when we've been on the road, so I don't mean to say I know all about their habits. But President Zacharias is not consistently did not get into the office as Mr. Downing did. Their styles were also rather different when it came to approaching the staff. If, and I think we talked about this in an earlier tape in reference to Mr. Downing, he may frequently get a large number of people together or people below the vice presidential level to discuss and solve the issues. President Zacharias' style is for vice presidents to be vice presidents and for deans to be deans and so forth. And rather than gathering a group together, and again, this is a general approach, there are exceptions in both their cases, he would lay out the issue to the vice president. He and the vice president would agree to the issue and he would ask the vice president or the vice presidents to pursue the matter and come back with recommendations. And that, as a result, also had some bearing, then, on the relationship of the office staff both to him and to the executive officer of the university. He, President Zacharias's, style was rather open. Both with the people on the campus as well as the media. President Downing had some reservations, had some uneasiness, I guess is a better word, with the media.

LH: I believe the other day the term you used perhaps was comfortable.

PC: He was not comfortable, I believe that's the one I used, with the media. President Zacharias, on the other hand, is not only comfortable, he's at home with the media. And that obviously relates to his field of preparation. If a person in communications is not comfortable with the media, I don't know who would be.

LH: Paul, this next question would be employing hindsight. Now after six years, we had talked the other day about the strengths and weaknesses of the other presidents you knew, what about Zacharias? What about his strengths?

PC: I think, again, as I guess I've said in other cases, these are relative to given situations. And I think a probably one of the greatest things that he brought to this campus when he came was a professional faculty role model in that he had been a

member of the graduate faculty at the University of Indiana and the University of Texas. He had directed doctoral students and he brought to the campus something that, well I guess a number of faculty, had not seen in the presidency here. Because I can't think of anyone we had in 1969 who was here when President Cherry was here. I don't think there was any. But he, as I said, I thought was a good role model for the faculty. He came at a time when the institution needed some healing because of some of the things we had talked about previously, division within the board and between the board and the presidency. We had, if you will recall, the summer or the fall of maybe 68, it was, anyway during the 68-69 school year, the Kentucky Education Association had attempted albeit maybe not to forcefully, but had attempted to organize food service people into a union type activity. And in retrospect that was not a major factor, even though at the time we spent a good deal of energy on it. But it was a factor. So there is a time when we needed healing, and I think he provided that. I think he generally started us on a little different course with regard to emphasis on academics. He did a number of things to let people know what was going on. This is not to take anything away from him, but he maximized, he got good mileage out of what was being done, because the media was obviously interested. He was an outsider. He was a more of an academic type than some of our previous presidents. And he was a person who was willing to talk to the media. And the media liked to talk to people like that. So he got a lot of mileage out of the media. He, I think another thing that was a strength and it was no where better exemplified than in the editorial in this morning's Courier Journal and that is that he quickly established himself as a superb spokesman for higher education in the state of Kentucky. And as you know, as emerged as the leading spokesman. If I might just say to you that yesterday was Sunday and he and I went to Frankfort for three meetings yesterday. One was with the executive committee of the Council of Higher Education and publicly as a part of the meeting he was complemented, regret was expressed that he was leaving, and then the legislative committee that was studying higher education, met that afternoon and more than one member of that panel expressed some regret and appreciation and a resolution of appreciation was passed. And I would say there had been some presidents that left the state that those things had not, or left the presidency and those things had not occurred.

LH: I'm sure of that.

PC: So that is a major factor. Before I get to the other side, somewhere between those two it should be noted that what happened with regard to the state picture between the time he was appointed and the time he arrived here. John Brown became governor in whatever that constitutional day is, December 12, 1968, yes, no, 70, 1970. The budget, the state budget that was presented to the legislature in January was basically the work of the Carroll administration, but Brown was governor and he put his endorsement on it. Higher education including this institution received the best budget that year, and I can't give you any numbers right now, I need to go back and look at them, that we had received in several years. Harry Largden and I were just, we were dancing on the rooftops at the thought of the kind of support we were going to get from

the state. And we made an operating budget and in the spring of 79, and we fowled up that date two or three steps back.

LH: I was aware of it at the time.

PC: Anyway, we made that operating budget, salary increases on the average were somewhere in the neighborhood of 8 to 10 percent, I think they were 8 percent. Again, I'd have to go back and look at that one. That was probably April of that year of 79, the Board selected President Zacharias on something like May 24, sometime in late May. He was to report here on August 1. And we had told him right after he was named we had a good budget and sent him all this material. On July either 15 or 16, Harry Largden and I made a trip to Eastern Kentucky at Arlington to meet with the presidents of the other institutions, George Atkinson and Bob Wand. George, at that time, was secretary of commerce and Bob was his assistant. And the thing they were there to tell us was that revenues were not going to make projections and we were going to get a reduction in our corporation. That was before Don got there, after he had been named president.

LH: Did you let him know about this?

PC: You can imagine how nervous staff felt about calling the president who was calling "We're here to tell you you've lost some money." And we went to work immediately to make those reductions. Without dragging that out anymore, that was the first of three reductions in state appropriations in the first two years he was here. And the appropriations for the biennia since then have been increases but very little.

LH: In other words the reductions were made before the budgets were adopted?

PC: No, we had already adopted the budget.

LH: No, the last biennium.

PC: Oh, yes, yes.

LH: You just cut it in advance.

PC: Oh, yes, twice more. So it needs to be noted that Don Zacharias has been here six years and the state appropriation for 1984-85, which will in effect be his last year, even though he's going to pass that a little bit, is not a great deal more than it was his first year here. Well, before the first cut came.

LH: The original budget.

PC: Again, I can't tell you those numbers exactly. Our state appropriation this year is \$34 million and plus. And it was over \$30 million. As I recall the original at that time was like \$32 million. So during that period of time, he has attempted to do a number of things with very limited funds. And as you know that has affected the reaction of people. In fact I am amazed that he has been here six years under those kinds of conditions and has the kind of support I think he still has on this campus. That's not to say that he's universally loved, but I think it really is amazing. I would not say that he has no weaknesses, because other than you and me, and I wonder about you a bit, I don't know of anyone who does not have some weaknesses. But he has done, I think, an exceptional job as president. One of the things that I think he has fallen down on in the last two or three years and, if he ever listens to this tape he will recall that we've had this kind of a conversation.

LH: We can hide this tape until he's gone.

PC: One of the things that he did quite well when he came was to pat people on the back. And with the press of things in the last two or three years he has not done that nearly as well as he did earlier.

LH: I would suggest, Paul, not only maybe patting on the back, but simply mingling.

PC: Right.

LH: I have not seen him in the faculty house for some time, and for a while there he showed up every once in a while.

PC: Yes, and that's another thing, and I would not excuse him, but I would give what I think is a reason. One of the things that happens and when he came for an interview people said "We want to see the president." And that's well and good, but there are also some realities in that one. Number one is that so does everyone else. Number two is there is an enormous call on the time of the president. I remember someone telling when Dwight Eisenhower became president of Columbia University that they had a daughter, I think it was, a child anyway, who was a student at Columbia, and they were having a class, and all of the sudden the door opened and here was Dwight Eisenhower, who stuck his head in the door and said to the teacher and students "How are you today." They were flabbergasted, all of them. If you look at the Eisenhower's role as a military officer, and apparently some of it carried over to Columbia University, number one he may have had a larger staff than president Zacharias, possibly a more competent staff, and certainly he delegated a lot more to the staff than President Zacharias did. But I think that's correct, that he did not mingle as much as he did earlier. I don't think it had any bearing on his lack of desire in that regard, it's just a matter of time. I think, yea, I used the expression "pat on the back" in some way and that's kind of a frivolous way of saying it, what I'm really talking about is he was not as effective in expressing appreciation to people for the things they were doing. And, as you know, if you don't

have money, you at least ought to say I still love ya. And then people would say "Well I don't want love, I want money." So it's a losing proposition, but nevertheless, it's probably one of the weaknesses. And again to balance that a little bit in the last two or three years he's spent a lot more time in Frankfort and other places working with the state level. There are those, and I don't share this, but I'm not objective about this because of my personal association with him, and if you like sometimes he's aloof. I don't happen to share that but if a person does, obviously that's the perception he has. And then I think a third thing that's happened and then again this is one that he and I have talked about a good deal in the last two or three years, as we have had an academic affairs changes in particularly the deanship, because, as you know, the vice presidential change just a year ago, and we have had more emphasis in some colleges on the search. As those rules and regulations related to the evaluation of people have been implemented, for those who did not like the way they were implemented, the president got much of the blame for that. And also, as there were communications breakdowns between the presidential level and the departmental level, whether it should have occurred or not, he got the blame for it. And if there were communications breakdowns, it's probably the president's responsibility to make sure they don't occur.

LH: He's certainly the one who's going to get blamed for it.

PC: That's correct. And, as you know, when it finally comes down to it, whatever happens on this campus is the responsibility of the president.

LH: Right.

PC: So, I think that's probably the other major void that I would note.

LH: Let me mention something that relates to that. I remember a comment on this point in the Herald after Don had been here about a year or so, and that was the way the changes in personnel occurred. The Herald, as I recall, referred specifically to the dear disappearance of Ray Cravens, which, of course, had started earlier.

PC: No, he left before Don came.

LH: Was it?

PC: Jim Davis was vice president when Don came.

LH: Yea, that's why I say it started under Downing but it continued, and I think it was after Zacharias came....

PC: He moved back....

LH: ...back to a professor of the department. And I remember that was one of the specific objections, one of the very few that the Herald, for instance, suggested at all.

PC: Yes, there are two things in that regard, and it goes back to the reductions in the state appropriation, in 81-82 fiscal year, and I can't remember much how they relate, but as you recall we had summary reorganization, the elimination of a college, the Applied Arts and Health, the consolidation of those departments in some cases, and the merger of the departments into other colleges, and the moving of Raymond Cravens from the Deanship back to a faculty position. And that's another thing that creates problems. On the one hand, people were saying we get more structure than we need, and when some of those changes were made, the president certainly received some heat from people. So it's another one of those things that is no win. I should mention another thing, and you probably have it on your list if I don't mention it, and that has to do, especially in more recent years, with the president's role with regard to athletics and specifically as it relates to football.

LH: I have that on my list.

PC: I thought you probably did.

LH: Go ahead.

PC: Well, I want to make sure that a fact gets into your record, and you can verify it, and also to give you an impression. President Zacharias had instructed vice president John Minton to reduce expenditures in athletics, and a part of that was a reduction in football grants in aid by 5. During this period of time, we have had some board members who were former football players and were much interested in the football program. We did have that reduction, we also eliminated one of the coaching positions. We had a fairly dismal won-loss record that year--maybe 2 and 8, something like that... it started the year before when we were 8 and 0 or 9 and 0 or something and went to Murray and lost 49 to nothing and then killed the horse running it around the track. And then the following year the disaster at Murray continued. We were 8 and 2 or 1, 8 and 1, or whatever it was. And some of those board members said "Hey, we've got to do something about this." So then we came back and we restored the scholarships and added a coach, and people forgot that President Zacharias had made the reductions. Then it probably reached a peak this last year when the football program not only expended its budget, but some additional dollars as well and President Zacharias got into the headlines of the local paper, that is the Park City Daily News and the campus newspaper, somewhat in an argument in the newspaper with the faculty senate and its study on football. And that was a mistake. I'm not saying that he could have done it any better, or that any of the rest of us would have done it any better, but it, I think proved to be a mistake in getting it in that context. On the other hand, I don't know what kind of reaction he was getting from board members on that. And one of the things, and as a former board member, you have more appreciation for this than I do, but one of the

things people on campus lose sight of is that a president has to answer to the board member because they're the ones that hire and fire him, and plus a lot more things. But in doing that, may disappoint faculty and student groups.

LH: At least some people, Paul, around campus have suspected that he may have given in in effect on the football program in order to get support for other areas that he may have considered more important.

PC: I think that is entirely possible, but I would be hard pressed to give you some illustrations. But I think that is entirely possible.

LH: I think one of the things that concerned many faculty members most about the whole situation is the fact that we go into the Sun Belt with great acclaim for the move. And it is a non football conference. And it seems to many people, I think, on the faculty, that in effect we made a decision on football at that time, and then immediately tried to reverse it.

PC: I understand, and that's a view, and I do not subscribe to that at all. I may not be right about it, first of all, the thing that undid us in my opinion in football was not the sunbelt. But if you will recall the college football association, the CNA, had a lawsuit going against the NCAA which reached the supreme court shortly after we moved into the sunbelt. And the effect of that on one AA programs was to eliminate any possibility, I'm talking from a realistic standpoint, not a legal standpoint, but any possibility 1 AA programs being on television. Now had we been able to get our program to winning position, and been on television as Eastern and Western and Murray have been previously and particularly on the super channel out of Nashville, we would not have had to have divided that revenue with anyone like the way we did in the OVC. Which means if we could have gotten one television appearance a year we would have probably balanced our football program. Because we have continued to play basically the same kind of schedule we played before, before we left the conference. Another reason why I don't think that undid us, is you look at the revenue from ticket sales at Eastern and Western, ours have been relatively the same, even though they in recent years have had a more successful record than we have had. They have not generated much more revenue and we have generated more than Murray in ticket sales. Now there are other factors involved in it, but I think people have looked at the move to the Sunbelt as an easy answer to that. As a matter of fact, Lowell, I think it goes much further than that, and that is that the division of one AA football really does not have, in my opinion, any good answers on the horizon. Because most of us are spending a considerable amount of money, because you're talking about a minimum of 60 scholarships, a fairly significant travel budget, and most of us have stadiums that will seat 12 to 20,000 people. And we could not fill our stadium for all home games and break even. We cannot generate enough money from ticket sales to break even.

LH: Paul suppose we talk a bit about Zacharias' relationship with some of his constituencies outside the campus. Well, the first one, I suppose, you would consider on the campus. What about his relationship with the Board of Regents?

PC: Oh, I think it has been superb. It did not occur to me until the other day that I have now been in the president's office for 15 years. And in looking back, and the only reason I mention it here, that's a fairly lengthy time to observe those kinds of things. He, number one, works at his relationship with board members. Board members, I think, respect him as an educator and as a leader. And he is good at communicating with people and in the dynamics of various kinds of meetings, particularly meetings such as board meetings. He also is good at keeping board members apprised of what is going on and in staying out of things like election for chairman and that kind of thing, and I think that's important. But I would give him exceedingly high marks for that kind of thing. And I think, also, he's pretty apt at saying, "OK, you're the board, if that's a position you're going to take, that's your position." And I think he has been successful on occasions of persuading them, but other times when he recognizes that they are the policy making body and that he's going to have to take their position, accept their position.

LH: What about his relationship with the Council?

PC: Again, for the most part has been very good. And the reason I would say from the most part, as you know from any group there is a collective sense of each of the individuals. Right now, and for the last few years, there is not a president in this state, in my opinion, who has the respect of the individual members the way he does. And I, again, have seen him, I have been with him at the big majority of the council meetings.

LH: What about the two governors since he's been president?

PC: Well, for one thing, the last two governors have been unlike previous governors as they relate to higher education. To begin with, Brown did not see the presidents very much. Governor prior to Brown, John Y. Brown, presidents had a good bit of contact with those governors and make sure they had good relations there. And not only with the governors but with their staff members. After President Zacharias came to campus and particularly after we received the first reduction in state appropriations, through, I think, the efforts of Harry Snyder, I'm not sure about that one, time's passed, and I've forgotten. Anyway, an arrangement was made for the president and one staff member to meet with the governor. And it had to do with financial matters. And I was privileged to go along with President Zacharias, and Governor Brown asked in that sitting some of the kinds of questions he's asked elsewhere, and it was obvious that he was applying Kentucky Fried Chicken principles to the management of the institutions. And he and Governor Brown, as far as I know, on a personal basis, I think, got along fine, but there was just not much of a relationship there between the governor and any of the presidents. And then Governor Collins has not necessarily had the Brown approach to

things, but again Governor Collins has stayed pretty much away from any kind of management affairs of the institutions. Again, their discussions of board appointments and that sort of thing, but not much...He and Governor Collins obviously have a good relationship because they knew one another as undergraduate students as well as Don Zacharias and Bill Collins. But there has not been a lot of interaction there, because she doesn't relate to it. And then, Lowell, there's a second thing that has occurred since he's been here, and that is we've had the diminishing role of the governor and the increasing role of the legislature in particularly in making state budgets. So that has also changed during this period of time.

LH: And of course in the case of Governor Collins in education her major concern has been below college level.

PC: At least that's what they've manifested so far. Time will tell.

LH: Alright, what about Don's relationship with the legislature in this new position of strength.

PC: I remember when he first came he made a speech somewhere and he said "One of the things I'll do is work with the legislature." So Bill Bivin and I took him aside and said "We need to educate you about Kentucky politics." We said you don't need to be worried about the legislature, you need to be worried about the governor. Well as Brown took a hands-off thing, Zacharias reminded us....

LH: I was wondering if he had.

PC: One of the things that I very much appreciated about him is the personal give and take. He and I have enjoyed a good personal relationship, and he doesn't fail to remind me of things like that. And I don't fail to remind him, either. But, anyway, the legislative involvement has evolved since he has been here. And he has worked with that quite well. For example, he has developed a good relationship with Bobby Richardson, who is a graduate of here. And then had also kept in pretty good shape with Don Blantford. So when there was a change in the leadership in the house, he was able to relate to the new speaker quite well.

LH: We've already talked a bit about finances, and you were talking about the budget cuts that were made. This gets over, I guess, a great deal in your own particular area there. There's been one cut after another mandated. OK, how do you go about making those cuts.

PC: Well, if you look at the three in the first two years, I thought the first one was the easiest of all from the standpoint, not the psychological standpoint, and in retrospect that was probably the easiest one psychologically. Because these things have a cumulative effect, not only dollar wise but on the emotion of people. But the first one, any budget

you make, until the last two or three, the last two I guess, have some, I wouldn't call them in our case fat, but they have some flexibility.

LH: You would call it fat at Eastern or other schools?

PC: Or if I were in Frankfort, I would probably call it fat. But some flexibility. For example, we always have a contingency. And it is dangerously low now. But we have had as a percentage....

LH: I think the auditors have objected to that.

PC: They certainly have. We had the unfortunate statement made by one officer that if we were a business, we would be bankrupt. And what it was saying had to do with the margin that we knew. So the first time we had a much larger margin than we now have as a percentage. So we took part of that, we had several unfilled positions which we took, and then we just did a small percentage across the board. Which in my opinion is not the best way to do it, but salary letters had already gone out then, and we were not about to say "We're going to cut your salary." So, as a matter of fact, I think one of the important things with three reductions in the state appropriations, we did not reduce salaries, albeit, we increased salaries during that period of time. Not big amounts, but we increased them. So we took that approach. Then the second one we had, we knew was coming in advance. And that came in the middle of preparing an operating budget, so we were able to incorporate that into our routine of preparing the budget. The third one, again, came at a time after the budget had been made, however some of us suspected it was coming. And simply did not make some expenditures early in that year, and we just in some cases refused to let people make expenditures and, in effect, took their money. There are two things, Lowell, that we try to do and the President is certainly in support of this. Number one, we agreed we were not going to cut salaries. And number two, we agreed that we were going to affect the instructional areas the least of all. And I think in the three, in all three cases, that turned out to be true.

LH: I would assume, Paul, that it would lead, however, to such things as preferred maintenance. The evils of which accumulate over the years.

PC: We have, in my opinion, on this campus right now as a result of this, three major kinds of problems. Now these are, there are subtopics to each one of these. One has to do with salaries. And not just for faculty, but probably more for faculty than any one else. But also in some staff areas it's equally as critical. Such as computer programmers. But faculty salaries. Secondly, not necessarily in order, but a second one, deferred maintenance. And that one is one that is going to plague this state, in my opinion. And it's not here, it's everywhere. And the third one has to do with equipment and particularly instructional equipment. And if you look at areas like the sciences, we probably right now could very easily spend \$2 million to update laboratories on this campus. Now some of us who are older only think of test tubes when we think of

laboratories, but I'm thinking about labs in the areas like engineering and industrial technology and others.

LH: Paul, I think some of my friends in Ogden College would consider your \$2 million to be a minimum figure.

PC: I understand that. And that's not totally incorrect, but I'm thinking more about small pieces of equipment. I'm not talking about the major pieces of equipment. I'm just talking about scales, microscopes, just little pieces of equipment. And that's to say nothing about our need to acquire state of the art kinds of equipment. Not at the same time, though, I would say, and again I can't be totally objective about this, when you look at the last five or six years and what's happened to our budget, I think it's amazing how much new equipment we've bought on this campus. We have hardly touched the end of the garment in meeting the need. But we have acquired a great deal of equipment in that period of time relative to what our budgetary situation was.

LH: In connection with that, Paul, we've made reference from time to time about the increased role of the council in recent years and all. In finances, haven't we, at least on some areas, been given more local autonomy?

PC: Yes the 84 legislature, I guess, passed what was House Bill 622, and it's KRS 164.050, I think, 05 something. That's probably not correct, but it's close. Anyway, that gives more local autonomy. There are only two of the A schools that have opted to operate under this full principle, six full principles of 622 and that's the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville. Now we operate under portions of it. The part that we have not opted for is in the area of construction. And you only need to look around the campus to see we don't need that right now. And then Kentucky State has not opted to operate under any of 622. But it is correct in areas like purchasing and some others that we have more local autonomy than we had.

LH: What is the current situation on the state formula for appropriations?

PC: The formula that was carved out two years ago has had what some of us have referred to as technical adjustments for this go around. That is for the upcoming biennial and we basically are using this same formula that we did two years ago.

LH: Do you think that's reasonably satisfactory from our viewpoint? Or is it simply the best that can be obtained?

PC: I spent a considerable amount of time on that and would say to you that as I look at the things I have done here I view that without meaning to be boastful, with a great deal of satisfaction because there was a principle that at least two of us out of the group, and the group included people from the Council on Higher Education, the office of Policy and Management, and the Legislative Research Commission in Frankfort and each

of the institutions. But there were two of us. The person from Eastern hammered at the beginning on the principle that there should be equal support for equal levels of instruction. Prior to that time the University of Kentucky got more dollars for instruction at the undergraduate level than we did. Now we said we would support additional support for doctoral instruction, but at the same level it ought to have the same level of support. And we got that incorporated into the formula. And I came home with a lot of satisfaction about that. Because there were people who said we would never get that done. And I think it too principle that should have had been accomplished. The formula compared with what we did previously I think is rather fair. Now I think that not just people in Kentucky but people in the nation need to be looking at some new ways of calculating support for higher education. And it's interesting there are now about 20 states out of the 50 that use a formula and Kentucky is just kind of held up as one of the premiere types, which is probably not justified, because we robbed everybody else to develop ours.

LH: Paul, this is scholarship.

PC: I understand that. Yes, sir. And that's exactly the pattern we followed. But it is a formula like most of them that is built on the enrollment increases. And as enrollments flatten out or decrease, there is a need to look at some of the formula funding pattern. And no one much is doing that right now.

LH: One of the things I've noticed in particular in the last day or two, and in the report for the strategic plan is that emphasis seems to be placed now on pointing out how much of the budget for higher education is actually in agricultural service,s medical services, this type of thing.

PC: Right, and I think that's one of the good things about the current council document. It does make that distinction. And some of us working on the formula, emphasize that. As a matter of fact, the formula has compartments for each of those activities. And you separate what's now called the primary vision areas, and basically they're community service areas, and research and instruction from these others.

LH: It would make the total budget for higher education look much, much smaller.

PC: Oh, yes, significantly less.

LH: Paul, one of the things that had occurred during the Zacharias administration would be the efforts to find other sources of revenue.

PC: Right, I should have mentioned that as a strength. In fact yesterday afternoon when we got out of the car from Frankfort, I don't know how we got on this, I pointed out to him that that is something that he has started. And that's not to say that the College Heights Foundation did not start an effort like that a long time ago, but, as you

know, their's has been what I would describe as passive, as opposed to an active fund-raising effort. We are in the embryonic stages of that. That's one that has to be in and move, I think, fairly slowly. But I think he has started that effort and somewhere way down the road someone else is going to reap the benefits of that.

LH: Now that, as I recall, you usually divide that into three parts, isn't it, when it's reported--The College Heights Foundation, then the Athletics, Red Towel Club, sort of thing, and then the Development funded itself.

PC: Right.

LH: I mentioned a moment ago the current strategic planning plan. What do you think about that. What direction does that seem to be leading in?

PC: Well, yesterday some members of the council agreed that presidents and board chairs should have a session with the.... The biggest weakness in that, I think, has been the process. And that is that it was developed almost at the current level without any institutional involvement. And those are lay people and presumably educators must know something about education, or hopefully anyway. And there has been a little involvement.

LH: I have, incidentally, I have just finished reading the revised plan and Western's comments on it. Well, I'm that much up to date.

PC: Well, as you know, in a sense it's not a plan. It's best described, in my opinion, as a series of propositions that they're going to take reactions from and then probably the last week in August we'll have a meeting with presidents and board chairs and then we'll begin to try to put together a plan. And this state, in my opinion, needs a plan, and think from that standpoint that is commendable. The, I don't guess, I'm not sure whether they're naive or just unknowing or what, but to speak about things such as general education and a core curriculum and to bring statements together on those without ever having talked with faculty members and giving faculty members an opportunity to comment on it, it almost a slap in the face. Now it's obviously not intended that way, but I think the conventional wisdom, if not more than that, has been that if faculty know anything they ought to know something about curricular kinds of matters. And they should have an opportunity to react to some of that.

LH: One of the points and it seemed rather vague, too, to me, was the centers of excellence that each school is to have.

PC: Yes, there are two things about that. One, they don't have, they have the name but not the plan. And I guess the part that some of us find most offensive about that relates to the endowed chairs. And under that, the state would, under the current version, the state would only match dollars at the University of Kentucky and th

University of Louisville. And President Zacharias has reacted to that point, as I'm sure he'll react again on the 19th.

LH: I think, reading the comments that Western presented--one of the main points being made there was that this is downplaying the importance of undergraduate education.

PC: Several of us see like the biggest overall weakness is that there is a preoccupation with graduate education. And I can't remember whether it's in that document, or somewhere else, we make a point that 87% of the people enrolled in Kentucky institutions in the fall of 1984 are undergraduates. And obviously, then, corresponding, some corresponding part of the state dollars should go to undergraduate education. All of us recognize that professional and graduate education is more expensive, but there is just this, as I said, this preoccupation with education at those levels.

LH: Were you surprised at Zacharias' departing?

PC: I can't give you an honest answer for that?

LH: Have you gotten to that point in your long tenure that they come and go?

PC: No, no. I can better react to that in the terms of when he came. When he came here I thought we'd probably have him for four years. I told him one day I didn't care how long he stayed, as long as I had retired. Now I'm hardly ready for retirement, I should add, or I hope I'm not. But he has stayed probably a little longer than I thought he would when he came. As he has described to me in the last couple of days when we've been together, some of the things that are at Mississippi State, had I known those in advance, I would not have been surprised at all.

LH: Such as.

PC: Well, of course I knew they had a veterinary school, but I did not know the magnitude of it. He said that the facilities are just outstanding. They have a new fine arts center under construction that rivals in nicety the center in Louisville, not in size, but he said it is just first rate. Of course I knew they had the Land Grant School. They are one of, I suppose, one of three flag ship schools in the state. They probably are closer to being the flag ship state than anyone, even though Ole Miss has a law school and Mississippi Southern is a growing institution.

LH: It's come along very much in recent years.

PC: They have a big budget compared to ours and bigger compared to the student body. It's a little bit misleading because much of it is already earmarked for such things as ag extension and the coop extension. And he said the thing that probably caught his

eye more than anything is the research and development center--they're calling it a technology center that is a joint venture of the community, the state and the campus. And it's strictly to serve the area. Sort of like some things people have been talking about in Kentucky. So in that context I'm not surprised that he went. It is, or that he has agreed to go, it is a significant professional move.

LH: Paul, what do you see as the major changes on the hill since you first became a member of it.

PC: Well, I guess the most apparent one is the physical change. A lot of buildings built in the period of time I've been here. The expansion of campus some with the taking of additional property on the south and west side....

.....secondly the name of the institution was changed from a state college to a university. Third, again, these are not in order of preference, just as they come to mind. Third, significant change in government style. As I mentioned on an earlier tape, when I came, the only involvement, it really wasn't faculty involvement then, in any matters was through the curriculum committee, and that was basically the heads, what few heads there were and we've evolved from that to the Academic Council to the Faculty Senate, plus a significant network of committees and faculty involvement there. The expansion of the organizational structure of the university more involvement of the faculty at the department and college level. And that's been a, as far as governance and faculty involvement, I view that as a mixed blessing. Because there are....well, the approaches from college to college is not consistent. And of course the biggest change there, I suspect, that is in faculty involvement at the department and college level, would be the involvement of faculty in tenure and promotion decisions of other people. The, another factor would be the codification of a lot of things, well, first the bringing into being of tenure and rank policies of grievance procedures for employees outside the faculty, the classification procedure, salary schedule. I think another thing that has happened that relates to where we're going, and I can tell you more about where we were than where we're going in this regard, is the role of this institution in the state picture and the addition of the University of Louisville and making Northern Kentucky a four-year institution or leaving Chase Law School at Northern, changes the picture as far as all the institutions are concerned and Western's role in it. Many years ago it was pretty clear to people at Western that Western was counted number two in the state and the Eastern people probably thought that they were number two. But it was pretty clear that we had a very, very prominent role in the state. Of course at that time there were, early when I came, I guess there were six public institutions in the state and Kentucky State had a role that was probably even more unique to them than their role is in the state now. Murray and Morehead were quite small and quite regional in the area from which they drew students. So there, are role in the state has changed. I'm not saying it's better or worse, but it has changed. I think bringing Don Zacharias to campus has created a situation at Western that I suspect will effect the search for the next president and how the board looks at that. Potentially we'll have what some refer to as the struggle between the old

and the new Western and I don't know what either one of those are. Or who the players are. But I think it has developed not a vision, necessarily, but an outlook that maybe is not as provincial as it was at one time. Lowell, another thing, and we talked about this on the first tape, in the period of time I've been here, I have seen the retirement of some very outstanding faculty members. I have seen other outstanding people come here, but I am not persuaded that we have a high percentage of outstanding faculty now as we had in the early 60s. And that needs some explanation, because some would misunderstand that. And I'm not being condescending toward the current faculty, it's just that, well I'm a faculty member, it's just that we, I thought, coming out of the 40s or 50s had a high percentage of outstanding people on the faculty. I think we have some outstanding people now, but because the faculty is larger, we may not have as high a percentage of outstanding people as we did then. We have had in the period of time I've been here some real characters who have been on the faculty, and particularly in the early 60s when there was such a growth. I remember in the late 60s when I was working with Raymond Cravens and a lady on Audubun Drive called Dr. Cravens and wanted to complain about a sociologist who was shooting bluebirds with an air rifle. And I'm not sure why I remember that, other than that he lived on Audubun Drive.

LH: Inappropriate spot.

PC: Another thing that has certainly occurred in this period of time is that the, well, we had a faculty member who came here from Australia. It was rumored that he was arrested one night at the Holiday Inn for dancing on top of the piano. And he was a little bit inebriated, and that immediately the next morning came to the attention of the president of the institution. Well, the individual's personal behavior is not viewed in the same way now as it was in that period of time. Of course, that is a matter that has changed all through the years. I remember seeing a piece of correspondence dated in the late 20s when some woman on College street wrote Dr. Cherry and said "Ms. so and so and Ms. so and so live next door and it is alleged that they come in and close their doors and smoke." So I suppose that is a trend that has continued.

LH: I don't think you mentioned, Paul, that I would suggest as important in regard to the faculty, is the much greater emphasis on research now. I can remember the day, when, I think Dr. Stickles was the first person I met, who had published a book. And this made headlines. When a faculty member published anything.

PC: Yes, as you and I both know, that is a growth pain at Western right now. Maybe it's not a growth pain, but it's a pain at Western right now. It goes back to my comment earlier, about how policies were being administered at the college level at the present time. No doubt but what we have a much greater emphasis on publications now and research now. And I would not use those terms synonymously, because I don't believe our current policy uses them synonymously, but there are some people who are applying those as if they were synonymous and it's probably the source of one of our trouble spots now. Without doubt there is a broadening aspect to the role of faculty members. It's

not just in research, it's in public service. Particularly in areas such as agriculture and teacher education. Again, if you go back to our student base, and I'm not sure I would have known if people had engaged in public service, but I think primarily their role was to teach.

LH: Of course considering the teaching loads that they carried, too, that was understandable.

PC: There was not much time left.

LH: What do you see in the future of Western, Paul, in the fairly immediate future? The next four or five years?

PC: Well, I think that we're going, unless we make an effort to attract more non-traditional age students, that we're going to see a probably not a continuing decline, not much greater decline in the enrollment, but not any increase. So I think one thing we're either going to see a smaller institution from the standpoint of enrollment, or no increase. I think there is a substantial market of part-time, nontraditional students. And in the last six or eight years, ten years, when there has been a lot of comment about that on campus, we have not been very successful in translating that from comment and statements like "Yes, we need to be doing that," to a plan to get it done. And I'm not sure that's going to happen. We have the potential to move into a role of being much greater partners with business and industry, not just in Bowling Green, but in this entire region. And there are a number of things going on now that could evolve fairly significantly. We have an industry that has talked to us some about developing a simulated manufacturing system on campus. That could be something from two rooms to a substantial facility. That, I think, potentially will impact us. I do not see us breaking out of the role of a "regional institution" as it's viewed at the state level. There are two things that, I think, significantly affected this institution in that regard. Not the creation of Northern Kentucky University but the bringing of Chase Law School there. And one of the ways an institution gets out of a masters' level role, is obviously having a professional or doctoral program. Law was something that the planners here had projected toward for a number of years. And there's probably not an undergraduate and master's level institution that has a law library the size of what we have. And the reason of that is that was looking toward that date. And then, of course, U of L, University of Louisville coming into the state system, substantially affected us.

LH: In many ways.

PC: In many ways, oh yes. And it's going to particularly going to affect how we're going to develop in the next few years. If you look at the demographic projections, Bowling Green over the last, what is it, five years, and Warren County is the fastest growing county in Kentucky. Those are percentages, and when you convert that to

numbers it's not all that great. But this area of the state is projected to grow rapidly. I think it's possible that the Saturn plant at Cherry Hill or Spring Hill, whatever that is....

LH: Spring Hill.

PC: Spring Hill in Tennessee has the potential to affect our area, because, when you think about it, that plant, there, and the General Motors plant here, that means up and down the I-65 corridor, that there potentially will be a number of spin off industries, the suppliers for those plants. And those who presume to know something about economic development think that is a substantial factor. Our development in the next four or five years will obviously be influenced greatly by the next president at Western and what kind of individual he or she is, the of direction they want to take the campus. I think had President Zacharias stayed there are some indications of which way we would have gone. And I don't know what that would be. The other thing that you and I both know and others as well, a president does not get the work his or her will, and presidents can have a lot of aspirations, but if you are not able to communicate those with others, and bring other people along, you can't see your goals become realities. And we might have someone come in here who had a vastly different approach and might, the campus might dig its heels in and say "we're not doing that." But I don't see any programmatic possibilities such as a professional school, that can substantially change us. I see one possibility that I'm not sure we're going to take advantage of and that is in Teacher Education. That one has cycled, there is going to be a demand for teachers, there are a lot of possibilities there that historically we should be able to capitalize on. Whether we will or not, time will tell. That was not very decisive was it?

LH: Well, time will tell. Do you see the longer range future very much the same as what you just described for the next two years.

PC: Yes. Again, unless there is a high technology, low technology, unless there is a technology explosion in this part of Kentucky that could affect us. For example, I don't think even the most astute people and the best planners will be able to project the impact of the Saturn plant on that part of Tennessee. If something happens on a smaller scale, but if something like that happened, this county or an adjacent county, it would have a dramatic impact on this institution, and fairly quickly. And there are some people who are trying to attract to this area. Industries and what not.

LH: Paul, you think of anything else you want to comment on? We have left many areas untouched.

PC: I have probably told more than I know now. Oh, I don't, as I said earlier, it just dawned on me yesterday I have worked in the president's office 15 years and I've been at this institution 25 years, and it's somewhat similar, I suppose, to liars telling stories, that you tell them so often that they become true. I have been associated with this institution so long that I'm sure I'm not very objective at all. I would like to think I have, because

one of the things I think I see frequently occurring with people who have long associations with organizations, is that they get to a point and they can't separate themselves from the organization. They cannot step back and look halfway objectively at it. And I'm not saying I can, but at least I try to continue to be conscious of that.

LH: Well, one hopes that one can be affectionate towards an institution but objective at the same time.

PC: I guess the other thing I would say that relates to me personally, is that the one regret I have, and there is no way, in my opinion, to resolve this, is not teaching some. But the last time I taught a class, a long, long time ago, I realized that if your schedule is dictated a good bit by other people, that that sort of becomes unfair to everyone involved. But I truly miss the kinds of experiences you have teaching.

LH: Shall we conclude on that note? Thank you, Paul.